Mélanges
chinois et bouddhiques

———————

The

VIGRAHAVYĀVARTANĪ of NĀGĀRJUNA

with the Author's Commentary

Edited by

E. H. JOHNSTON

AND

ARNOLD KUNST

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

The present work, which is the result of a joint effort of Professor E. H. Johnston and myself, was just completed before the former's sudden and premature death at Oxford, England, in 1942. Almost immediately after Professor Johnston's death the paper was submitted to the Royal Asiatic Society, which accepted it for publication, but owing to technical and financial difficulties that arose in connection with the war and its aftermath, the manuscript lay for a number of years in the safe of the Society, which was not in a position to effect the publication. Owing to these circumstances the RAS agreed to the withdrawal of the paper; it has now found a hospitable reception by the " Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques ", to which the writer

feels greatly indebted on behalf of the deceased and on his own behalf. It is hoped that in spite of the inevitable delay this modest contribution will still serve its purpose as an addition to the treasury of important texts.

When Professor Johnston suggested to me some years ago the joint restoration of Nāgārjuna's treatise I grasped the opportunity of rendering useful and palatable an important Buddhist text whose defects in the only available Sanskrit version edited by R. Sāṅkṛtyāyana had worried me since I first came to read it. In the course of our collaboration we used to meet two or three times a week for discussion, and after nearly two years' work the common task took shape in what is presented to the Sanskrit student as the possibly nearest approximation, as we both believed it, of Nāgārjuna's original text.

Professor Johnston's tragic death rendered impossible the joint utilization of a number of remaining sheets with his and my scribbled comments. The arrangement of the text, the introduction and the critical apparatus are the result of joint work. A few dubious points, however, had been tentatively left unsolved in the otherwise final draft with the intention to discuss and possibly insert or substitute them at some later stage. This never materialized and there was never an opportunity of discussing them together. With the purpose of presenting the text as it was left off at Johnston's death it has remained unaltered except for some minor modifications and corrections of errors. It has been also found more practical to publish the text in Roman characters rather than in Devanāgarī, in which it was originally written.

The following list, which has been prepared later, suggests therefore in addition a few supplementary adjustments and alterations which, in my opinion, render the text final, and may serve as variants to the notes originally attached to the text. The reader will make his own choice as to the preferable version.

Text p. 109, 16-17, note 13 : It may be better to maintain partly the text as conveyed in R and to read śūnyeṣu sarvabhāveṣu tvad-vacanamaśūnyam, yenāśūnyatvāt sarvabhāvasvabhāvaḥ prasiddhaḥ.

*This reading seems to be the simplest and it fulfills the test of fitting
into the actual discussion : " If you maintain that, whereas all* bhāvas
*are void, your words are not void, then by means of non-void words
you prove the* svabhāva *of all* bhāvas." *The proof arises from the
exclusion of words (of which the* sarvabhāvas *are predicable) from
the* sarvabhāvas *which thus stop being* sarvabhāvas. *I also suggest
a slightly different interpretation of the meaning in the phrase on
p. 110, 5, note 3 : If the* pratiṣedha *is valid, then the words
expressing this* pratiṣedah *are void, and so any statement uttered
by means of void words is consequently not valid.*

*As for kārikā 21 the cæsura between the first and second quarter
falls in the middle of the word, i.e. before the locative ending of*
sāmagrī. *A similar phenomenon occurs in kārikā 25 where the
cæsura between the third and fourth quarter falls before the genitive
ending of* śabda.

On p. 125, 3, note 1 for preference read with R śūnyena vacanena
in spite of T and Y.

In kārikā 35 (note 8) the reading saṃparidhakṣyatyapi *instead
of* paridhakṣyatyapi *seems to give a satisfactory solution to the
difficulty in metre.*

P. 134, 11, note 8 : Kasyacid *is meant to be ambiguous. It
probably alludes to the old controversy as to whether* para *in the*
parārthānumāna *refers to the object being proved or to the " other "
person for whom it is being proved. Therefore C must have meant
it rather " for " than " of " a certain man.*

Read kārikā 51 b : parasparato na cānyaiḥ pramāṇair vā. *This
reading seems to be accounted for also by the commentary ;* anya *fits
better in the context than* para.

*Although the wording as given on p. 143, 10-13, notes 6-9,
renders the text more lucid than it is in R, R's version could be
maintained with some slight modifications, namely :* tatra yadi tāvat
sad, asad iti pratijñā hīyate / na hīdānīṃ tad asad idānīṃ sad /
athāsad : asadbhūtasya nāma na bhavati / tasmād...

ARNOLD KUNST

INTRODUCTION

Among the minor works of Nāgārjuna the Vigrahavyāvartanī *takes a special place as an admirable illustration of his dialectical methods, as the only extant example of his prose style, and as a lucid exposition of his views on the conceptions of* śūnyatā *and* svabhāva. *While sufficient material for the study of the work has been published in recent years, it has not appeared in a form which made understanding of his arguments easy or even certain.*

Tibetan translations have proved more than once invaluable help in restoring corrupt Sanskrit texts and thus it is hoped that workers in the field of Buddhist studies and Indian philosophy will find it convenient to have an edition of the Sanskrit text, which is readable and as close to the original as the materials permit; hence this volume, providing what might perhaps be called better a restoration rather than an edition of the treatise.

Of the three available authorities the first is the Sanskrit MS., discovered by Rev. Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana in the Tibetan monastery of Żalu and edited by him in an appendix to Vol. XXIII, Part III, of the Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, *referred to henceforward by the letter R. The MS. was written, probably in India, by a Tibetan in the Tibetan character and dates probably to the beginning of the XII*[th] *century. Assuming that it has been correctly transcribed, it is incredibly corrupt, with innumerable mistakes, omissions and interpolations, and the majority of the kārikās offend, often unnecessarily, against the rules of prosody. R corrects some of the minor mistakes (additions in round brackets), and has made additions from the Tibetan version (square brackets in text) or has given alternative readings from the same source in the footnotes; but unfortunately these additions and alternatives often fail to reproduce correctly the information the Tibetan gives us about the state of the text it used, and in general the edition should be regarded as a copy of the MS. with little change. Next there is the Tibetan*

translation, for which has been used the version published by Tucci in the Pre-Diṅnāga Buddhist Texts on Logic from Chinese Sources, *hereafter called T; though it is far from being a critical edition and has a number of passages which are corrupt or from which an essential word has dropped out, it has not been possible to go behind it, as it makes use of all the Tibetan editions available in the course of this work. Help has been however derived in doubtful passages from an excellent French translation of it, published by S. Yamaguchi in the* Journal Asiatique, *tome CCXV, pp. 1-86, hereafter called Y. As usual, the Tibetan text appears to be verbatim, but it has one unusual feature in that there exist two separate translations of the kārikās, one of which often fails to give either the text or the sense of the Sanskrit correctly[1]; in the majority of cases where the differences occur the version put by Tucci in the footnotes is the more correct. Finally there is the Chinese translation, here denoted by C, for which has been used the text printed as No. 1631 in the Taisho Issaikyo edition of the Chinese Tripiṭaka, Vol. XXXII. It is the work of Gautama Prajñāruci and is dated 541 A.D. Much of it follows the Sanskrit closely, far more so than might appear from the translation which Tucci gave of it in the volume quoted above, but occasionally its version is so far removed from the Sanskrit and Tibetan as well as from the logical developement of the argument, that it can only be supposed either that the translator had failed to understand the original or that he was unable to express it in Chinese. The translation of the kārikās is in general more defective than that of the commentary.*

The textual problems to be solved by this edition are of unusual complexity and no uniform rule can be rigidly applied for their solution. Inevitably R provides the basis for the Sanskrit, and owing to the large amount of repetition there is seldom any difficulty in settling the particular terms used or the equivalents of T's and

---

[1] For more details cf. ARNOLD KUNST, *Kamalaśīla's Commentary on Śāntarakṣita's Anumānaparīkṣā of the Tattvasaṅgraha*, Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques, vol. VIII, pp. 154-155, offprint pp. 48-49.

C's versions. Thus except for minor details the text which T had before him can almost invariably be restored with certainty, but necessarily this is not the case with C, which accordingly is mainly of use for its corroboration of one of the other authorities when they differ. Where possible then, in such instances, the text confirmed by C has been accepted. In a very few cases preference was given to C over the other two, in view of its age; the most important instance is the final clause of kārikā 20, where the opponent states his conclusion. When C is ambiguous or when all three authorities differ among themselves, the judgement on the nature of the argument and of Nāgārjuna's highly individual style had to decide on the reading. In the result it appears that nearly all the kārikās now are presented in the form which the author gave to them, and that too with a minimum of conjecture. The number of kārikās has been reduced to 70, the traditional number for such works because the opponent's verse preceding 34, which has hitherto been treated as a kārikā, is shown by the Sanskrit wording to be a quotation, while the final verse, numbered 72 in R, belongs to the commentary, not to the main work. For the commentary a similar degree of certainty is unattainable; the best has been done so that Nāgārjuna's arguments seem to have been rendered correctly except for a few doubtful passages and two or three minor details, in particular the use of particles such as api *and* iti *and variations between the sources in the longer or shorter statement of argument cannot be decided for good and all. Nevertheless these uncertainties, however trying such minutiae are to the editor, are not such as to impair the value of the text as a statement of Nāgārjuna's views. The apparatus criticus, unavoidably lengthy, has been kept within bounds as much as possible; no mention is made of cases where R has made acceptable minor emendations of the MS. or where the division of the sentences has been altered. Where the text rests on T as against R, the Tibetan text is not quoted as it is easily accessible; and when T differs from the text adopted, generally its reading is quoted only in what is taken to be the form of the Sanskrit text used by the translator. No suggestions of*

amendments have been made which would be necessary to put C's text in order. C has not been quoted in full when it corroborates R or T against the other, but new translation has been occasionally given of troublesome passages. For the corrupt list of kuśala dharmas *in the commentary on verse 7 it was deemed sufficient to give a general reference to the paper in the* Indian Historical Quarterly, *XIV, pp. 314 ff., where the complicated evidence was fully set out and discussed. Except for these cases, omissions from the apparatus, which unfortunately could not be entirely avoided, are due to oversight. In the text use is made occasionally of commas to facilitate its comprehension.*

The scope of this work does not include discussion of the more general problems raised by the text, but on one or two points a few words are desirable. In the first place it is a perfect specimen of contemporary dialectics, illustrating such old descriptions as we have of philosophical disputations. Every point has to be stated in the full and every objection has to be taken in its proper order and refuted. The style accordingly is decidedly archaic in character, devoid of the allusive references and elliptic statements which often make the dialectics of a later period hard to read. The Sanskrit, in general, is good, and the few usages, to which exception might be taken, are probably due to uncorrected corruptions, for instance the curious compound avidyamānagṛha *in the commentary on verse 64 in the sense of " not being present in the house", and the phrase* tulyam ayam aprāptaḥ, *" like this (fire which dispels darkness) without coming in contact with it ", in the commentary on verse 39. Specifically Buddhist words and usages are rare, the two most obvious cases being* adhilaya *" libel", in verse 63, and* pratiṣedhyato *" (taking a thing) as capable of being refuted", in verse 13. The rules governing the* āryā *metre are found to be strictly observed when the verses are restored to their correct form, thus proving that this type of verse must have been well established for some time before the second century A.D.*

While the text is divided in two parts, 20 verses setting out the

opponents' criticisms of Nāgārjuna's views and 50 verses giving his reply, the objections are not in fact all made by the same critic. The dharmāvasthāvid *theorists of verse 7 are clearly Buddhist; though it is difficult to determine their school, the details in the commentary exclude the possibility of their being Sarvāstivādins, to whose theory of the* dharmas *much of the argument elsewhere would apply. The polemic against the validity of the Naiyāyika* pramāṇas *in verses 30-51 is more important, because it raises by its parallelism with* Nyāyasūtras, II, i, 8-19, *the question whether Adhyāya ii of that composite work was in existence when Nāgārjuna wrote. The parallelism has already been dealt with by Y in his notes, by Tucci on pp. 34 ff. of the notes on his translation, and by R in his Introduction. Without going into details it may be remarked that Vātsyāyana's* bhāṣya *clearly has Nāgārjuna's position in mind, but it is not obvious that either Nāgārjuna knew the sūtras or vice versa; till the matter is more fully examined all that can safely be said is that the two works reflect the dispute between the two schools at much the same stage, but not necessarily with reference by one to the other. But one point is certain and that is that Nāgārjuna took some of the Naiyāyika arguments from a different work of that school. For he quotes a verse from it just before kārikā 34, and the Naiyāyikas evidently admitted the validity of his criticisms, since the views put forward in that verse are mentioned by Vātsyāyana only to be rejected as incorrect and are stated by Vācaspati Miśra, Tātparya-* ṭīkā *on II, i, 19, to have been held by an* ācāryadeśiya. *It appears therefore that the verse in question is quoted from some treatise by this discredited teacher, whose name we are never likely to learn. It also seems doubtful if the Naiyāyika principle quoted in the commentary on verse 31,* pramāṇato 'rthānāṃ prasiddhiḥ, *is in exact accord with the Sūtras; for the opening words of the bhāṣya on Nyāyasūtras, I, i, 1, appear to have been chosen with great care precisely with the object of evading Nāgārjuna's criticisms.*

ABBREVIATIONS

C   *Vigrahavyāvartanī*, Chinese translation, *Chinese Tripiṭaka*, Taisho Issaikyo, XXXII, No. 1631.

MMK   *Mūlamadhyamikakārikās*, ed. LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, Bibl. Buddh. IV.

R   *Vigrahavyāvartanī*, Sanskrit text, ed. Rāhula SĀṄKRTYĀ-YANA, JBORS, XXIV, III.

T   *Vigrahavyāvartanī*, Tibetan translation in G. TUCCI, *Pre-Diṅnāga Buddhist Texts on Logic from Chinese Sources*, Gaekwad's Or. Ser., XLIX.

Y   *Vigrahavyāvartanī*, French translation of the Tibetan translation, by S. YAMAGUCHI, Journal Asiatique, CCXV, pp. 1-86.

e.c.   ex conjectura.

om.   omits.

THE VIGRAHAVYĀVARTANĪ

sarveṣāṃ bhāvānāṃ sarvatra na vidyate
svabhāvaścet/
tvadvacanamasvabhāvaṃ   na   nivartayi-
tuṃ   svabhāvamalam[1] // 1 //

yadi sarveṣāṃ bhāvānāṃ hetau pratyayeṣu ca hetupratyayasā-
magryāṃ ca pṛthak ca[2] sarvatra svabhāvo na vidyata iti kṛtvā
śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā iti[3] / na hi bīje hetubhūte 'ṅkuro 'sti, na
pṛthivyaptejovāyvādīnāmekaikasmin pratyayasaṃjñite[4], na pratya-
yeṣu samagreṣu[5], na hetupratyayasāmagryāṃ, na hetupratya-
yavinirmuktaḥ pṛthageva ca[6] / yasmādatra sarvatra[7] svabhāvo
nāsti tasmānniḥsvabhāvo 'ṅkuraḥ / yasmānniḥsvabhāvastasmāc-
chūnyaḥ[8] / yathā cāyamaṅkuro[9] niḥsvabhāvo niḥsvabhāvatvācca
śūnyastathā sarvabhāvā api[10] niḥsvabhāvatvācchūnyā iti /

atra vayaṃ brūmaḥ[11] / yadyevam, tavāpi[12] vacanaṃ yadetac-
chūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā iti tadapi śūnyam / kiṃ kāraṇam / tadapi hetau
nāsti mahābhūteṣu samprayukteṣu viprayukteṣu vā, pratyayeṣu
nāstyuraḥkaṇṭhauṣṭhajihvādantamūlatālunāsikāmūrdhaprabhṛtiṣu
yatneṣu[13], ubhayasāmagryāṃ nāsti[14], hetupratyayavinirmuktaṃ
pṛthageva ca[15] nāsti / yasmādatra sarvatra nāsti tasmānniḥsvabhā-

---

[1] asvabhāvam, R.
[2] R adds yatra.
[3] T om. iti.
[4] °saṃjñeti, R.
[5] R adds na hetupratyayeṣu samagreṣu.
[6] vā, R.
[7] R om. sarvatra, but cf. similar sentence below.   T adds ayam.
[8] T om. yasmān niḥsvabhāvas, which C has.
[9] T om. ayam.
[10] R om. api.
[11] T om. this sentence.
[12] T om. api.
[13] yan naiva, R.
[14] R om. na.
[15] vā, R.

vam / yasmānniḥsvabhāvaṃ tasmācchūnyam[1] / tasmādanena sarva-
bhāvasvabhāvavyāvartanamaśakyaṃ[2] kartum[3] / na hyasatāgninā[4]
śakyaṃ dagdhum / na hyasatā śastreṇa śakyaṃ chettum / na
hyasatībhiradbhiḥ[5] śakyaṃ kledayitum / evamasatā vacanena[6] na
śakyaḥ sarvabhāvasvabhāvapratiṣedhaḥ kartum[7] / tatra yaduktaṃ
sarvabhāvasvabhāvaḥ pratiṣiddha[8] iti tanna /

atha   sasvabhāvametadvākyaṃ   pūrvā[9]
hatā pratijñā te/
vaiṣamikatvam   tasmin   viśeṣahetuśca
vaktavyaḥ // 2 //

athāpi manyase mā bhūdeṣa doṣa iti sasvabhāvametadvākyaṃ
sasvabhāvatvāccāśūnyaṃ[10] tasmādanena sarvabhāvasvabhāvaḥ pra-
tiṣiddha[11] iti, atra brūmaḥ / yadyevam, yā te pūrvā[12] pratijñā
śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā iti hatā sā /

kiṃ cānyat / sarvabhāvāntargataṃ ca tvadvacanam / kasmāc-
chūnyeṣu sarvabhāveṣu tvadvacanamaśūnyam, yenāśūnyatvātsar-
vabhāvasvabhāvaḥ pratiṣiddhaḥ[13] / evaṃ ṣaṭkoṭiko vādaḥ prasak-
taḥ / sa punaḥ kathamiti / hanta cetpunaḥ śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvāstena

---

[1] *niḥsvabhāvatvācchūnyam,* T.

[2] T om. *svabhāva.*

[3] R adds *kiṃ kāraṇam,* not in C.

[4] *asadagninā,* R.

[5] R om. *hi.*

[6] T adds *api.*

[7] R adds the gloss *na śakyaḥ sarvabhāvasvabhāvo nivartayitum.*

[8] R adds *sarvatra bhāvasvabhāvo vinivartate.*

[9] *śrutvā,* R; C as in text.   Y's explanation of *vaiṣamikatva* by *viṣamavyāpti* is anachronistic; here it means " discordance ".

[10] T has *tasmāc* for *sasvabhāvatvāc.*

[11] R adds *sarvabhāvasvabhāvo vinivartate.*

[12] R om. *evam yā* and *pūrvā;* C has the latter.

[13] The three authorities differ hopelessly in this sentence. The text follows R, adding *chūnyeṣu,* which appears in both T and C, and substituting *pratiṣiddhaḥ* for its *svabhāvaprasiddhaḥ.*   T has approximately *kasmāt? sarvabhāveṣu śūnyeṣu satsv evam aśūnyatvāt tena sarvabhāvasvabhāvaḥ pratiṣiddha iti tvadvacanam aśūnyam bhavet.* C literally would give *yasmāc chūnyāḥ sarvabhāvās tasmāt tvadvacanaṃ śūnyam, tena śūnyatvāt sarvabhāvapratiṣedho na bhavet.*

tvadvacanaṃ śūnyaṃ sarvabhāvāntargatatvāt [1] / tena śūnyena pratiṣedhānupapattiḥ / tatra yaḥ pratiṣedhaḥ śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā [2] iti so 'nupapannaḥ / upapannaścetpunaḥ śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā iti pratiṣedhastena tvadvacanamapyaśūnyam / aśūnyatvādanena pra-tiṣedho 'nupapannaḥ [3] / atha śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvāstvadvacanaṃ cāśūnyaṃ yena pratiṣedhaḥ, tena tvadvacanaṃ sarvatrāsaṃgṛhī-tam [4] / tatra dṛṣṭāntavirodhaḥ / sarvatra cetpunaḥ saṃgṛhītaṃ [5] tvadvacanaṃ sarvabhāvāśca śūnyāstena tadapi śūnyam / śūnya-tvādanena nāsti pratiṣedhaḥ / atha śūnyamasti cānena pratiṣedhaḥ śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā iti tena śūnyā api sarvabhāvāḥ kāryakriyāsam-arthā bhaveyuḥ / na caitadiṣṭam / atha śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā na ca kāryakriyāsamarthā bhavanti mā bhūd dṛṣṭāntavirodha iti kṛtvā, śūnyena tvadvacanena sarvabhāvasvabhāvapratiṣedho no-papanna iti [6] /

kiṃ cānyat / evaṃ tadastitvād [7] vaiṣamikatvaprasaṅgaḥ kiṃ-cicchūnyaṃ kiṃcidaśūnyamiti / tasmiṃśca [8] vaiṣamikatve viśe-ṣaheturvaktavyo yena [9] kiṃcicchūnyaṃ kiṃcidaśūnyaṃ syāt / sa ca nopadiṣṭo hetuḥ / tatra yaduktaṃ śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā iti tanna /
kiṃ cānyat /

mā śabdavadityetatsyātte buddhirna caitadupapannam/

---

[1] R adds *tvadvacanasya*.

[2] *śūnyaḥ sarvabhāva*, R, which omits *so*.

[3] The three authorities differ for these two sentences. The text follows C, the argument being that, if the *pratiṣedha* is valid, the words expressing it must be non-void, and since they are non-void and are included in all things, the statement that all things are void is not valid. T reads *anupapannas, śūnyam* and *śūnyatvāt*, which does not give as good sense. R as in text, but omitting °*m apy aśūnyam a*°.

[4] T seems to have had *sarvāntarasaṃgṛhītam*, which is perhaps better.

[5] R om. *saṃ*.

[6] T om. *iti*.

[7] T has *de skad zer na* for *tadastitvād*, the equivalent of which is not clear; C is no help, and it seems necessary to have something to show that the case contemplated is that in which the statement is non-void.

[8] T apparently had *sati ca* for *tasmiṃśca*.

[9] R adds *hi viśeṣahetunā*.

śabdena   hyatra[1]   satā   bhaviṣyato   vāra-
ṇaṃ   tasya // 3 //

syātte buddhiḥ[2], yathā nāma kaścid brūyānmā śabdaṃ kārṣīriti[3]
svayameva śabdaṃ kuryāttena ca śabdena tasya śabdasya[4] vyāvar-
tanaṃ kriyeta[5], evameva śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā iti śūnyena[6] vacanena
sarvabhāvasvabhāvasya vyāvartanaṃ kriyata iti / atra vayaṃ
brūmaḥ / etadapyanupapannam / kiṃ kāraṇam[7] / satā hyatra
śabdena bhaviṣyataḥ śabdasya pratiṣedhaḥ kriyate / na punariha[8]
bhavataḥ satā vacanena sarvabhāvasvabhāvapratiṣedhaḥ kriyate /
tava hi matena vacanamapyasat, sarvabhāvsvabhāvo 'pyasan /
tasmādayaṃ mā śabdavaditi viṣamopanyāsaḥ[9] /

pratiṣedhapratiṣedho   'py[10]evamiti   ma-
taṃ   bhavettadasadeva/
evaṃ   tava   pratijñā   lakṣaṇato   dūṣyate
na   mama // 4 //

syātte buddhiḥ, pratiṣedhapratiṣedho 'py[11]anenaiva kalpenānu-
papannaḥ, tatra yadbhavān sarvabhāvasvabhāvapratiṣedhavacanaṃ
pratiṣedhayati[12] tad[13]anupapannamiti / atra vayaṃ brūmaḥ /
etadapyasadeva[14] / kasmāt / tava hi pratijñālakṣaṇaprāptaṃ[15] na

---

[1] T and R omit *hy*, which is required by the metre and is given by R when the
verse is repeated before kārikā 25.

[2] T omits the phrase, but C has it.

[3] R repeats *mā śabdaṃ kārṣīr* and omits *svayam eva śabdaṃ kuryāt;* T and C
as in text.

[4] R om. *tasya śabdasya.*

[5] kriyate, R.

[6] *svabhāvaśūnyena,* T.

[7] T om. *kiṃ kāraṇam,* certified by C.

[8] T om. *punar.*

[9] °*nyāso 'sann iti,* R, which then adds *kiṃ ca,* not in T or C.

[10] *pratipratiṣedhye 'py,* R.

[11] *pratiṣedhaḥ pratiṣedhyo 'py,* R.

[12] T, which is not clear, apparently read *bhavataḥ... vacanapratiṣedhavacanam,*
omitting *pratiṣedhayati.*

[13] T adds *apy.*

[14] *etadaśabdena sad eva,* R.

[15] °*prāpte mataṃ,* R. C, as well as T, omits *matam.*

mama / bhavān bravīti śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā iti nāham[1] / pūrvakaḥ
pakṣo na mama [2] / tatra yaduktaṃ pratiṣedhapratiṣedho ʻpyevaṃ
satyanupapanna iti [3] tanna /

kiṃ cānyat /

pratyakṣeṇa hi tāvadyadyupalabhya vi-
nivartayasi bhāvān /
tannāsti pratyakṣaṃ bhāvā yenopala-
bhyante // 5 //

yadi pratyakṣataḥ sarvabhāvānupalabhya bhavānnivartayati
śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā iti tad[4]anupapannam / kasmāt / pratyakṣamapi
hi pramāṇaṃ sarvabhāvāntargatatvācchūnyam / yo bhāvān[5]upala-
bhate so ʻpi śūnyaḥ / tasmāt pratyakṣeṇa [6] pramāṇena nopalam-
bhabhāvo ʻnupalabdhasya ca pratiṣedhānupapattiḥ / tatra yad-
uktaṃ [7] śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā iti tadanupapannam /

syātte buddhiḥ, anumānenāgamenopamānena vā sarvabhā-
vānupalabhya [8] sarvabhāvavyāvartanaṃ kriyata iti, atra brūmaḥ /

anumānaṃ pratyuktaṃ pratyakṣeṇāga-
mopamāne ca /
anumānāgamasādhyā ye ʻrthā dṛṣṭānta-
sādhyāśca // 6 //

anumānopamānāgamāśca pratyakṣeṇa pramāṇena pratyuktāḥ /
yathā [9] hi pratyakṣaṃ pramāṇaṃ śūnyaṃ sarvabhāvānāṃ śūnya-
tvādevamanumānopamānāgamā [10] api śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvānāṃ śū-

---

[1] R adds *tasmāt tvatpratijñān napayāmi.*

[2] T omits these two sentences, which C has.

[3] *pratiṣedhaḥ pratiṣedhyo ʻpy evam matam iti upapannam iti,* R.

[4] T adds *api.*

[5] *yo ʻpi sarvabhāvān,* R.

[6] T om. *pratyakṣeṇa.* This and the previous sentence appear very differently
in C, which brings in *anumāna,* apparently confusing it with *upalabdhi.*

[7] R om. *tatra yad uktam.*

[8] T om. *sarvabhāvān,* and adds *etat* before *sarvabhāva°.*

[9] *tathā,* T.

[10] *anumānamopamāgamā,* R.

nyatvāt / ye[1] 'numānasādhyā arthā āgamasādhyā upamānasādhyāśca
te 'pi śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvānāṃ śūnyatvāt / anumānopamānāga-
maiśca yo[2] bhāvānupalabhate so 'pi śūnyaḥ[3] / tasmādbhāvānām-
upalambhābhāvo 'nupalabdhānāṃ ca svabhāvapratiṣedhānupa-
pattiḥ / tatra yaduktaṃ śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā iti tanna /

kiṃ cānyat /

kuśalānāṃ   dharmāṇāṃ   dharmāvasthāvi-
daśca   manyante /
kuśalaṃ   janāḥ   svabhāvaṃ[4]   śeṣeṣv-
apyeṣa   viniyogaḥ // 7 //

iha janā[5] dharmāvasthāvido manyante kuśalānāṃ dharmā-
ṇāmekonaviṃśaśatam[6] / tadyathaikadeśo vijñānasya vedanāyāḥ
saṃjñāyāścetanāyāḥ sparśasya manasikārasya cchandasyādhimo-
kṣasya vīryasya smṛteḥ samādheḥ prajñāyā upekṣāyāḥ prayogasya
saṃprayogasya   prāpteradhyāśayasyāpratighasya ratervyavasāya-
syautsukyasyonmugdherutsāhasyāvighātasya vaśitāyāḥ pratighāta-
syāvipratisārasya parigrahasyāparigrahasya ... dhṛteradhyavasāya-

---

[1] R adds *api.*

[2] R adds *api.*

[3] *śūnyaḥ syāt,* R; *syāt* is probably a corruption from *tasmāt,* missing at the
beginning of the next sentence.

[4] *janasvabhā,* R, omitting *vaṃ.*

[5] R om. *janā.*

[6] The following list of 119 qualities has been fully discussed in E. H. Johnston's,
Nāgārjuna's List of Kuśala-dharmas, IHQ, XIV, 314-323, and therefore the full
apparatus criticus which was given there is here omitted. The text of R has many
corruptions and some omissions, and C gives 107 qualities only, so that the list
cannot be restored in its entirety. Probable suggestions cannot be made for the
following numbers, 30 (*dran pa,* T, possibly a formation from *smṛ* signifying
remorse), 51 (R and T between them suggest something like *ananukūlābhyava-
hāratā*), 70 (*vyavakāratā?*), 76 (possibly *middha,* not considered loc. cit., but see
on 75 below) and 107 (*ṛddhi* or an equivalent word). The following restorations
are uncertain in varying degrees, 22 (*unmugdhi*) a word not otherwise known,
26 (*pratighāta*), 28 and 29 (*parigraha* and *aparigraha*), 34 (*anunmugdhi,* cf. on 22),
71 (*dākṣya*), 75 (possibly *upayāsa* only, the rest of the word going to 76, for which
see above), 80 (*adhyātmasaṃprasāda*), 102 (*manana*) and 106 (*araṇa*). The first
81 qualities are in the genitive after *ekadeśa,* because they are *kuśala* in certain
aspects only, not in all.

syānautsukyasyānunmugdheranutsāhasya prārthanāyāḥ praṇidher-
madasya viṣayāṇāṃ viprayogasyānairyāṇikatāyā utpādasya sthiter-
anityatāyāḥ samanvāgamasya jarāyāḥ paritāpasyāratervitarkasya
prīteḥ prasādasya ... premṇaḥ pratikūlasya pradakṣiṇagrāhasya
vaiśāradyasya gauravasya citrīkārasya bhakterabhakteḥ śuśrūṣāyā
ādarasyānādarasya praśrabdherhāsasya vāco vispandanāyāḥ
siddhasyāprasādasyāpraśrabdheḥ ... dākṣyasya sauratyasya vipra-
tisārasya śokasyopāyāsāyāsasya ... apradakṣiṇagrāhasya saṃśayasya
saṃvarāṇāṃ pariśuddheradhyātmasaṃprasādasya bhīrutāyāḥ, śra-
ddhā hrīrārjavamavañcanamupaśamo 'cāpalamapramādo mārda-
vaṃ pratisaṃkhyānaṃ nirvairaparidāhāvamado 'lobho 'doṣo
'mohaḥ sarvajñatāpratiniḥsargo vibhavo 'patrāpyamaparicchada-
naṃ mananaṃ kāruṇyaṃ maitryadīnatāraṇā ... anupanāho 'nīrṣyā
cetaso 'paryādānaṃ kṣāntirvyavasargo 'sauratyaṃ paribhogānvayaḥ
puṇyamasaṃjñisamāpattirnairyāṇikatāsarvajñatāsaṃskṛtā dharmā
ityekonaviṃśaśataṃ kuśalānāṃ dharmāṇāṃ [1] kuśalaḥ svabhāvaḥ.

tathākuśalānāṃ dharmāṇāmakuśalaḥ [2] svabhavaḥ, nivṛtāvyākṛ-
tānāṃ [3] nivṛtyākṛtaḥ [4], prakṛtāvyākṛtānāṃ prakṛtyākṛtaḥ [5],
kāmoktānāṃ kāmoktaḥ, rūpoktānāṃ rūpoktaḥ, ārūpyoktānām-
ārūpyoktaḥ, anāsravāṇāmanāsravaḥ, duḥkhasamudayanirodhamār-
goktānāṃ duḥkhasamudayanirodhamārgoktaḥ [6], bhāvanāprahāta-
vyānāṃ bhāvanāprahātavyaḥ, aprahātavyānāmaprahātavyaḥ [7] /
yasmādevamanekaprakāro dharmasvabhāvo dṛṣṭastasmādyaduk-
taṃ [8] niḥsvabhāvāḥ sarvabhāvā niḥsvabhāvatvācchūnyā iti tanna /
kiṃ cānyat /

---

[1] R om. *dharmāṇām ;* °*śatasya* would be better.

[2] R om. *dharmāṇām.*

[3] R om. *nivṛtāvyākṛtānām.*

[4] T adds *svabhāvaḥ,* which C omits.

[5] *anivṛtāvyākṛtānām anivṛtāvyākṛtaḥ svabhāvaḥ,* T; but C supports R, suggesting however *prakṛty*° or *prākṛtā*°. The category cannot be recognized.

[6] R gives these four separately, *duḥkhoktānāṃ duḥkhoktaḥ* etc., against C and T.

[7] C om. *aprahātavyānām aprahātavyaḥ,* and R adds *prahātavyānāṃ prahāta-vyaḥ.*

[8] R adds *iha* after *tasmād.*

nairyāṇikasvabhāvo   dharmā [1]   nairyāṇi-
kāśca   ye   teṣām /
dharmāvasthoktānāmevamanairyāṇikādī-
nām [2] // 8 //

iha ca dharmāvasthoktānāṃ [3] nairyāṇikānāṃ dharmānāṃ nairyā-
ṇikaḥ svabhāvaḥ, anairyāṇikānāmanairyāṇikaḥ [4], bodhyaṅgikānāṃ
bodhyaṅgikaḥ, abodhyaṅgikānāmabodhyaṅgikaḥ, bodhipakṣikā-
ṇāṃ [5] bodhipakṣikaḥ, abodhipakṣikāṇāmabodhipakṣikaḥ / evam-
api [6] śeṣāṇām / tadyasmād [7]evamanekaprakāro dharmānāṃ sva-
bhāvo dṛṣṭastasmād [8]yadyuktaṃ niḥsvabhāvāḥ sarvabhāvā niḥsva-
bhāvatvācchūnyā iti tanna /

kiṃ cānyat /

yadi   ca   na   bhavetsvabhāvo   dharmāṇāṃ
niḥsvabhāva   ityeva [9] /
nāmāpi   bhavennaivaṃ   nāma   hi [10]   nir-
vastukaṃ   nāsti // 9 //

yadi sarvadharmāṇāṃ svabhāvo na bhavettatrāpi niḥsvabhāvo
bhavet / tatra niḥsvabhāva ityevaṃ nāmāpi na bhavet / kasmāt /
nāma hi nirvastukaṃ kiṃcidapi nāsti / tasmānnāmasadbhāvātsva-
bhāvo bhāvānāmasti svabhāvasadbhāvāccāśūnyāḥ [11] sarvabhāvāḥ /
tasmādyaduktaṃ [12] niḥsvabhāvāḥ sarvabhāvā niḥsvabhāvatvācchū-
nyā iti tanna /

---

[1] *dharmo*, R.

[2] *eva ca nair*°, R; C also shows *evam*.

[3] *dharmo 'vastho*°, R; C omits the entire compound.

[4] T adds *svabhāvaḥ*, and C adds the same word after each item.

[5] R's *bodhipākṣika* is contrary to Buddhist usage.

[6] R om. *api*.

[7] *tasmād*, T, for *tad yasmād*.

[8] *yasmād*, R.

[9] *ity evam*, R.

[10] *nāmāpi*, R, against the metre; cf. the repetition of the verse before kārikā 57.

[11] R omits most of this passage from the beginning of the commentary up to here, probably passing from the first *svabhāvo* to the second; it runs: *yadi dharmā-ṇāṃ svabhāvo bhāvānāṃ svabhāvānāṃ sadbhāvāc cāśūnyaḥ*. This is restored from T, and C agrees in sense.

[12] *tatra yad uktam*, R.

kiṃ cānyat /

atha vidyate svabhāvaḥ sa ca dhar-
māṇāṃ na vidyate tasmāt /
dharmairvinā svabhāvaḥ sa yasya[1] tad-
yuktamupadeṣṭum // 10 //

atha manyase mā bhūdavastukaṃ nāmeti kṛtvāsti svabhāvaḥ,
sa punardharmāṇāṃ[2] na saṃbhavati, evaṃ dharmaśūnyatā
niḥsvabhāvatvāddharmāṇāṃ siddhā[3] bhaviṣyati, na ca nirvastukaṃ
nāmeti, atra vayaṃ brūmaḥ / evaṃ yasyedānīṃ[4] sa svabhāvo
dharmavinirmuktasyārthasya sa[5] yuktamupadeṣṭumarthaḥ / sa ca
nopadiṣṭaḥ / tasmādyā kalpanāsti svabhāvo na sa[6] punardhar-
māṇāmiti sā hīnā /

kiṃ cānyat /

sata eva pratiṣedho nāsti ghaṭo geha
ityayaṃ yasmāt /
dṛṣṭaḥ pratiṣedho 'yaṃ sataḥ svabhā-
vasya te tasmāt // 11 //

iha ca sato 'rthasya pratiṣedhaḥ kriyate nāsataḥ / tadyathā nāsti
ghaṭo geha iti sato ghaṭasya pratiṣedhaḥ kriyate nāsataḥ / evameva
nāsti svabhāvo[7] dharmāṇāmiti sataḥ svabhāvasya pratiṣedhaḥ
prāpnoti nāsataḥ / tatra yaduktaṃ niḥsvabhāvāḥ sarvabhāvā[8] iti
tanna / pratiṣedhasaṃbhavādeva sarvabhāvasvabhāvo 'pratiṣid-
dhaḥ[9] /

kiṃ cānyat /

---

[1] *yasyāsti*, R, against the metre; cf. the repetition of the verse before kārikā 60.
[2] *sarvadharmāṇām*, T.
[3] *niḥsvabhāvatvam* and *siddham*, R.
[4] *kasyedānīṃ*, R.
[5] *tatra*, R, for *sa*.
[6] R om. *sa*.
[7] R om. *sva*.
[8] R adds *niḥsvabhāvatvāc chūnyā*, not in C or T.
[9] °*svabhāvaḥ prasiddhaḥ*, T; C's equivalent is not clear, but it certainly did not
have *prasiddhaḥ*.

atha nāsti sa svabhāvaḥ kiṃ nu prati-
ṣidhyate tvayānena/
vacanenarte vacanātpratiṣedhaḥ sidhy-
ate hyasataḥ // 12 //

atha nāstyeva sa svabhāvo [1] 'nena vacanena niḥsvabhāvāḥ [2]
sarvabhāvā [3] iti kiṃ bhavatā pratiṣidhyate / asato hi [4] vacanādvinā [5]
siddhaḥ pratiṣedhaḥ, tadyathāgneḥ śaityasya, apāmauṣṇyasya /
kiṃ cānyat /

bālānāmiva mithyā mṛgatṛṣṇāyāṃ yathā-
jalagrāhaḥ [6] /
evaṃ mithyāgrāhaḥ syātte pratiṣedhy-
ato [7] hyasataḥ // 13 //

syātte buddhiḥ, yathā bālānāṃ mṛgatṛṣṇāyāṃ mithyā jalamiti
grāho bhavati, nanu [8] nirjalā sā mṛgatṛṣṇeti tatra paṇḍitajātīyena
puruṣeṇocyate tasya grāhasya [9] vinivartanārtham, evaṃ niḥsva-
bhāveṣu yaḥ svabhāve grāhaḥ [10] sattvānāṃ tasya vyāvartanārthaṃ
niḥsvabhāvāḥ sarvabhāvā ityucyata iti [11], atra brūmaḥ /

nanvevaṃ satyasti grāho grāhyaṃ ca
tadgrahītā [12] ca/
pratiṣedhaḥ pratiṣedhyaṃ pratiṣeddhā
ceti ṣaṭkaṃ tat // 14 //

---

[1] R om. *atha* and *sa* and adds *iti* after *svabhāvo*.

[2] T om. *svabhāvāḥ*, possibly owing to a misprint.

[3] R om. *sarva*.

[4] T has *evam* for *hi*.

[5] *vināpi*, T.

[6] In view of the commentary on verse 66, *yathājalagrāhaḥ* must be a compound here.

[7] *pratiṣidhyato*, R. Translate according to the common use of *-tas*, " Thus would be your misconception of the non-existing as something that can be refuted."

[8] T om. *nanu*.

[9] *mithyāgrāhasya*, R.

[10] Should the reading be *svabhāvagrāhaḥ*?

[11] T om. *ucyata iti*, which is given also by C.

[12] *tadgṛhītaṃ*, R.

yadyevaṃ [1], asti tāvatsattvānāṃ grāhaḥ [2], asti grāhyam, santi
ca tadgrahītāraḥ [3], asti pratiṣedhastasyāpi mithyāgrāhasya, asti
pratiṣedhyaṃ yadidaṃ [4] mithyāgrāho [5] nāma, santi ca [6] pratiṣed-
dhāro yuṣmadādayo 'sya grāhasyeti [7] siddhaṃ ṣaṭkam / tasya
ṣaṭkasya prasiddhatvād[8]yaduktaṃ śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā iti tanna /

atha   naivāsti   grāho   naiva [9]   grāhyaṃ
na   ca   grahītāraḥ /
pratiṣedhaḥ   pratiṣedhyaṃ   pratiṣeddhāro
nanu [10]   na   santi // 15 //

atha mā bhūdeṣa doṣa iti kṛtvā naiva grāho 'sti naiva grāhyaṃ
na ca grahītāra ityevaṃ sati grāhasya yaḥ[11] pratiṣedho niḥsvabhāvāḥ
sarvabhāvā iti so 'pi nāsti, pratiṣedhyamapi nāsti, pratiṣeddhāro
'pi na santi /

pratiṣedhaḥ   pratiṣedhyaṃ   pratiṣeddhā-
raśca   yadyuta   na   santi /
siddhā   hi   sarvabhāvāsteṣāmeva [12]   sva-
bhāvaśca // 16 //

yadi ca na pratiṣedho na pratiṣedhyaṃ na pratiṣeddhāraḥ
santyapratiṣiddhāḥ sarvabhāvā asti ca sarvabhāvānāṃ[13] svabhavaḥ /
kiṃ cānyat /

---

[1] R adds *nanv eva saty.*

[2] *mithyāgrāhaḥ,* R; *grāho 'pi,* T.

[3] *santi satvā grahītāraḥ,* R.

[4] T om. *yad* and adds *api.*

[5] *°grāhyaṃ,* R.

[6] R om. *ca.*

[7] *mithyāgrāhasyeti,* R.

[8] *ṣaṭkasyāpy aprasiddhatvāt,* R, omitting *tasya; aprasiddhatvād,* T; C shows
°siddha.

[9] *na ca,* R, against the metre; cf. the commentary.

[10] e.c.: *sya tu,* R, which C and T omit.

[11] R om. *yaḥ.*

[12] *yeṣām evaṃ,* R.

[13] T om. *sarva,* which C has.

hetośca te[1] na siddhirnaiḥsvābhāvyāt[2]
kuto hi te hetuḥ/
nirhetukasya siddhirna copapannāsya te
'rthasya // 17 //

niḥsvabhāvāḥ sarvabhāvā ityetasminnarthe te hetorasiddhiḥ /
kiṃ kāraṇam / niḥsvabhāvatvāddhi sarvabhāvānāṃ śūnyatvāttato [3]
hetuḥ kutaḥ / asati hetau nirhetukasyārthasya śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā
iti kuta eva prasiddhiḥ / tatra yaduktaṃ śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā iti
tanna /
kiṃ cānyat /

yadi cāhetoḥ siddhiḥ svabhāvavinivar-
tanasya te bhavati/
svābhāvyasyāstitvaṃ mamāpi nirhetu-
kaṃ siddham // 18 //

atha manyase nirhetukī [4] siddhirniḥsvabhāvatvasya bhāvānāmiti
yathā tava svabhāvavinivartanam [5] nirhetukaṃ siddhaṃ tathā
mamāpi svabhāvasadbhāvo [6] nirhetukaḥ siddhaḥ [7] /

atha hetorastitvaṃ bhāvāsvābhāvyam[8]-
ityanupapannam/
lokeṣu niḥsvabhāvo[9] na hi kaścana
vidyate bhāvaḥ // 19 //

---

[1] *hetos tato*, R; cf. the repetition of the verse before kārikā 68.

[2] *naiḥsvābhāvya* is an odd form; the length of the second syllable is guaranteed by the metre. In the four occurences in MMK, the text has *naiḥsvābhāvya* twice, and *naiḥsvabhāvya* twice, but none of them occur in a verse.

[3] *śūnyatvān na tato*, R, which omits *kutaḥ*, but C as well as T has *kutaḥ*.

[4] *nairhetukī*, R; T adds *tatra*.

[5] R om. *vi*, but cf. the kārikā.

[6] R adds *'pi*.

[7] T adds a gloss, *mamāpīti mamāsti*.

[8] *bhāvanaiḥsvabhāvyam*, R, against the metre.

[9] *loke naiḥsvabhāvyāt*, R, but T and the commentary show *niḥsvabhāvo;* *lokeṣu* is uncertain, as T does not show the plural, and perhaps therefore *loke 'pi*.

yadi hetorastitvaṃ manyase [1] niḥsvabhāvāḥ sarvabhāvā iti, tadanupapannam / kiṃ kāraṇam / na hi loke niḥsvabhāvaḥ kaścid-bhāvo 'sti /

kiṃ cānyat /

pūrvaṃ   cetpratiṣedhaḥ   paścātpratiṣe-dhyamityanupapannam [2] /
paścāccānupapanno [3]   yugapacca   yataḥ svabhāvaḥ   san [4] // 20 //

iha pūrvaṃ cetpratiṣedhaḥ paścācca pratiṣedhyamiti [5] nopa-pannam / asati hi pratiṣedhye kasya pratiṣedhaḥ / atha paścāt-pratiṣedhaḥ pūrvaṃ pratiṣedhyamiti ca [6] nopapannam / siddhe hi pratiṣedhye kiṃ pratiṣedhaḥ karoti / atha yugapatpratiṣedha-pratiṣedhya iti [7] tathāpi na pratiṣedhaḥ pratiṣedhyasyārthasya kāraṇam [8], pratiṣedhyo na pratiṣedhasya ca, yathā yugapadut-pannayoḥ śaśaviṣāṇayornaiva [9] dakṣiṇaṃ savyasya kāraṇaṃ savyaṃ vā dakṣiṇasya kāraṇaṃ bhavatīti [10] / tatra yaduktaṃ niḥsvabhāvāḥ sarvabhāvā iti tanna /

---

[1] This sentence may not be in order; it would improve it to put *manyase* before *hetor* and add *ca* after *niḥsvabhāvāḥ*.   R inserts *iha* at the beginning, and C seems to have had *niḥsvabhāvasya* before *hetor*.   T is ambiguous, but probably had *bhāvānāṃ niḥsvabhāvānām eva* (or possibly in the locative) before *hetor* and also *eva* after *astitvam*.   The argument is that " if you suppose that the cause exists in reality and that all things (which include the cause) are without essence (so that the cause is at the same time really existent and without essence), that argument is not valid."

[2] *iti ca nopapannam*, R, against the metre and the reading in the repetition before kārikā 69.

[3] R om. *ccā*, but see the repetition.

[4] *svabhāvo 'san*, R and T; but C's reading followed above is unquestionably correct as giving the opponent's final conclusion.   *Yataḥ* here means " and therefore ", a common use at the close of a verse.

[5] R adds *niḥsvabhāvyam* and T *niḥsvabhāvam* before *iti*, an obvious interpolation which C omits.

[6] T om. *ca*.

[7] T om. *iti*.

[8] R adds *prati na*.

[9] C omits *śaśa*, possibly rightly, as the argument applies equally well to real horns.

[10] T om. *iti*.

atrocyate / yattāvadbhavatoktaṃ

sarveṣāṃ bhāvānāṃ sarvatra na vidyate svabhāvaścet /

tvadvacanamasvabhāvaṃ na nivartayituṃ svabhāvamalamiti //

atra brūmaḥ /

hetupratyayasāmagryāṃ ca pṛthak cāpi[1]
madvaco na yadi/
nanu śūnyatvaṃ siddhaṃ bhāvānām-
asvabhāvatvāt // 21 //

yadi madvaco hetau nāsti mahābhūteṣu[2] samprayukteṣu vipra-
yukteṣu vā[3], pratyayeṣu nāstyurahkaṇṭhauṣṭhajihvādantamūlatālu[4]-
nāsikāmūrdhaprabhṛtiṣu yatneṣu, nobhayasāmagryāmasti[5], hetu-
pratyayasāmagrīvinirmuktaṃ pṛthageva ca nāsti[6], tasmānniḥsva-
bhāvam[7], niḥsvabhāvatvācchūnyam / nanu[8] śūnyatvaṃ siddhaṃ
niḥsvabhāvatvādasya madīyavacasaḥ / yathā caitanmadvacanaṃ
niḥsvabhāvatvācchūnyaṃ tathā sarvabhāvā api[9] niḥsvabhāva-
tvācchūnyā[10] iti / tatra[11] yadbhavatoktaṃ tvadīyavacasaḥ śūnya-
tvācchūnyatā sarvabhāvānāṃ nopapadyata iti tanna /

kiṃ cānyat /

yaśca pratītyabhāvo bhāvānāṃ śūnyateti
sā proktā[12]/
yaśca[13] pratītyabhāvo bhavati hi tasy-
āsvabhāvatvam // 22 //

---

[1] R omits the first *ca*, then reads *pṛthagbhāve 'pi* against the metre.

[2] *he nāsti mātohābhūteṣu*, R.

[3] *vāpi*, T.

[4] °*kaṇṭhojihvādantatālu*°, R.

[5] R om. *yatneṣu nobhayasā.*

[6] *pṛthag vāsti*, R.

[7] °*bhāvā*, R.

[8] R adds *evam* before *nanu.*

[9] R om. *api.*

[10] *chūnyam*, R.

[11] R om. *tatra.*

[12] R om. *bhāvo* and *sā proktā;* the restoration of the last word (*brjod*, T) is not certain.

[13] R om. *yaśca.*

śūnyatārthaṃ ca bhavān [1] bhāvānāmanavasāya pravṛtta upālam-
bhaṃ vaktuṃ tvadvacanasya niḥsvabhāvatvādbhāvānāṃ [2] svabhā-
vapratiṣedho nopapadyata iti / iha hi yaḥ pratītyabhāvo bhāvānāṃ [3]
sā śūnyatā / kasmāt / niḥsvabhāvatvāt / ye hi pratītyasamutpannā
bhāvās te na sasvabhāvā bhavanti svabhāvābhāvāt / kasmāt [4] /
hetupratyayasāpekṣatvāt [5] / yadi hi svabhāvato bhāvā bhaveyuḥ,
pratyākhyāyāpi hetupratyayaṃ ca [6] bhaveyuḥ / na caivaṃ bhavanti /
tasmānniḥsvabhāvā niḥsvabhāvatvācchūnyā ityabhidhīyante / evaṃ
madīyamapi   vacanaṃ   pratītyasamutpannatvānniḥsvabhāvaṃ [7]
niḥsvabhāvatvācchūnyamityupapannam / yathā ca pratītyasamut-
pannatvāt svabhāvaśūnyā api [8] rathapaṭaghaṭādayaḥ sveṣu sveṣu
kāryeṣu kāṣṭhatṛṇamṛttikāharaṇe madhūdakapayasāṃ dhāraṇe śīta-
vātātapaparitrāṇaprabhṛtiṣu vartante [9], evamidaṃ [10] madīyavacanaṃ
pratītyasamutpannatvān[11]niḥsvabhāvamapi[12] niḥsvabhāvatvaprasā-
dhane bhāvānāṃ [13] vartate / tatra yaduktaṃ niḥsvabhāvatvāt
tvadīyavacanasya śūnyatvaṃ, śūnyatvāttasya ca tena[14] sarvabhā-
vasvabhāvapratiṣedho nopapanna iti tanna /

---

[1] *bhāvān*, R.

[2] The text is uncertain; it seems correct to follow T as reproducing the wording
of kārikā 1.   R reads *tvadvacanasya śūnyatvāt tvadvacanasya niḥsvabhāvatvād
evaṃ tvadvacanena niḥsvabhāvena bhāvānām.*   C suggests an original *tvadvacanaṃ
śūnyaṃ niḥsvabhāvatvāt, tena niḥsvabhāvena bhāvānām*, which finds some confir-
mation in the last sentence of the commentary on this verse.

[3] R reads *pratītya bhāvānāṃ bhāvaḥ.*

[4] *tasmāt*, R; C om. *kasmāt.*

[5] *°pratyayāpekṣa°*, R.

[6] Should *ca* be omitted?

[7] *°samutpannaṃ tasmān niḥsvabhāvam*, T.

[8] R om. *api.*

[9] For the restoration of this sentence it is advisable to follow C, which gives
the text, except that it appears to read *°prabhṛtiparitrāṇe.*   T om. *ratha*, *kāṣṭha-
tṛṇamṛttikā* and *prabhṛtiṣu.*   R has *kāṣṭhāhaṇamṛttikāharaṇaṃ ... dhāraṇam.*
Better perhaps *rathaghaṭapaṭādayaḥ*, as suggested by T and the order of the
following locatives.

[10] T om. *idam*, substituting probably *api.*

[11] *pratyayasamut°*, R.

[12] R om. *api.*

[13] *sādhanaṃ pratyayabhāvānām*, R.

[14] T om. *śūnyatvaṃ śūnyatvāt tasya ca tena*, but C apparently had the text also.

kiṃ cānyat /

nirmitako nirmitakaṃ māyāpuruṣaḥ sva-
māyayā sṛṣṭam /
pratiṣedhayeta[1] yadvat pratiṣedho 'yaṃ
tathaiva syāt // 23 //

yathā nirmitakaḥ puruṣo 'nyaṃ nirmitakaṃ puruṣaṃ kas-
miṃścidarthe vartamānaṃ[2] pratiṣedhayet, māyākāreṇa vā sṛṣṭo
māyāpuruṣo 'nyaṃ māyāpuruṣaṃ svamāyayā sṛṣṭaṃ[3] kasmiṃścid-
arthe vartamānaṃ pratiṣedhayet, tatra yo nirmitakaḥ puruṣaḥ
pratiṣidhyate so 'pi[4] śūnyaḥ / yaḥ pratiṣedhayati so 'pi śūnyaḥ[5] /
yo māyāpuruṣaḥ pratiṣidhyate so 'pi śūnyaḥ / yaḥ pratiṣedhayati
so 'pi[6] śūnyaḥ / evameva madvacanena śūnyenāpi[7] sarvabhāvā-
nāṃ svabhāvapratiṣedha upapannaḥ / tatra yadbhavatoktaṃ[8]
śūnyatvāttvadvacanasya sarvabhāvasvabhāvapratiṣedho nopapanna
iti tanna / tatra yo bhavatā[9] ṣaṭkoṭiko vāda uktaḥ so 'pi tenaiva[10]
pratiṣiddhaḥ / naiva hyevaṃ sati na sarvabhāvāntargataṃ madva-
canaṃ, nāstyaśūnyam[11], nāpi sarvabhāvā aśūnyāḥ[12] /
yatpunarbhavatoktaṃ

atha sasvabhāvametadvākyaṃ pūrvā hatā pratijñā te /
vaiṣamikatvaṃ tasmin viśeṣahetuśca vaktavya iti //

---

[1] pratiṣedhayate, R; but grammar and the commentary require the optative.
For the verse cf. MMK, XVII, 31, 32.

[2] So T, adding the necessary anyam from C.   R has yathā nirmitakaḥ puruṣam
abhyāsataṃ tu kaścid arthena vartamānam.

[3] T omits svamāyayā sṛṣṭam, which should be quoted here from the verse; it is
probably the phrase underlying R's reading, māyāpuruṣa samanyāva tan na.   C
omits the phrase both in the verse and here.

[4] R om. api.

[5] R om. śūnyaḥ / yo.

[6] R om. pratiṣidhyate so 'pi śūnyaḥ / yaḥ pratiṣedhayati so 'pi.

[7] R om. api.

[8] T om. bhavatā.

[9] R om. tatra yo bhavatā.

[10] sa evaṃ, R.

[11] nāsti śūnyam, R.

[12] śūnyaḥ, R.

atrāpi brūmaḥ /

na   s v ā b h ā v i k a m e t a d v ā k y a ṃ   t a s m ā n n a
v ā d a h ā n i r m e /

n ā s t i   c a   v a i ṣ a m i k a t v a ṃ   v i ś e ṣ a h e t u ś c a
n a   n i g a d y a ḥ // 24 //

na tāvanmamaitadvacanaṃ [1] pratītyasamutpannatvāt svabhāvo-
papannam / yathā pūrvamuktaṃ svabhāvānupapannatvācchūnyam-
iti [2] / yasmāccedamapi madvacanaṃ śūnyaṃ śeṣā api sarva-
bhāvāḥ [3] śūnyāḥ, tasmānnāsti vaiṣamikatvam / yadi hi vayaṃ
brūma idaṃ vacanamaśūnyaṃ śeṣāḥ sarvabhāvāḥ śūnyā iti tato
vaiṣamikatvaṃ syāt [4] / na caitadevam / tasmānna vaiṣamikatvam /
yasmācca vaiṣamikatvaṃ na sambhavatīdaṃ vacanamaśūnyaṃ
śeṣāḥ punaḥ [5] sarvabhāvāḥ śūnyā iti, tasmādasmābhirviśeṣahe-
turna [6] vaktavyo 'nena hetunedaṃ [7] vacanamaśūnyaṃ sarva-
bhāvāḥ punaḥ [8] śūnyā iti / tatra yadbhavatoktaṃ [9] vādahāniste
vaiṣamikatvaṃ ca viśeṣahetuśca tvayā vaktavya iti tanna /

yatpunarbhavatoktaṃ [10]

mā śabdavadityetatsyātte buddhirna caitadupapannam /
śabdena hyatra satā bhaviṣyato vāraṇaṃ tasyeti //

atra brūmaḥ /

mā   ś a b d a v a d i t i   n ā y a ṃ   d r ṣ ṭ ā n t o   y a s t v a y ā
s a m ā r a b d h a ḥ /

ś a b d e n a [11]   t a c c a   ś a b d a s y a   v ā r a ṇ a ṃ   n a i -
v a m e v a i t a t [12] // 25 //

---

[1] R om. *etad;* possibly *na tāvad etan madvacanam.*
[2] R om. *iti.*
[3] T om. *sarva,* but has it in the next sentence.
[4] T adds *api.*
[5] T om. *punaḥ.*
[6] T om. *°viśeṣa°.*
[7] R om. *hetunā.*
[8] T om. *punaḥ.*
[9] T om. *bhavatā.*
[10] T om. *bhavatā.*
[11] R adds *hi* against the metre; alternatively read *śabdena hi tac chabdasya.*
[12] *naiva me vacaḥ,* R.

nāpyayamasmākaṃ dṛṣṭāntaḥ / yathā kaścinmā śabdaṃ kārṣīriti
bruvan śabdameva karoti śabdaṃ ca pratiṣedhayati, tadvat tacchū-
nyaṃ vacanaṃ na [1] śūnyatāṃ pratiṣedhayati / kiṃ kāraṇam / atra
hi dṛṣṭānte śabdena śabdasya vyāvartanaṃ kriyate / na caitadevam /
vayaṃ brūmo niḥsvabhāvāḥ sarvabhāvā niḥsvabhāvatvācchūnyā
iti [2] / kiṃ kāraṇam /

naiḥsvābhāvyānāṃ cennaiḥsvābhāvyena [3]
vāraṇaṃ yadi hi/
naiḥsvābhāvyanivṛttau svābhāvyaṃ hi
prasiddhaṃ syāt // 26 //

yathā mā śabdaṃ kārṣīriti [4] śabdena śabdasya vyāvartanaṃ
kriyate, evaṃ yadi naiḥsvābhāvyena vacanena naiḥsvābhāvyānāṃ
bhāvānāṃ [5] vyāvartanaṃ kriyate tato 'yaṃ dṛṣṭānta upapannaḥ
syāt / iha tu naiḥsvābhāvyena vacanena bhāvānāṃ svabhāva-
pratiṣedhaḥ kriyate / yadi [6] naiḥsvābhāvyena vacanena bhāvānāṃ [7]
naiḥsvābhāvyapratiṣedhaḥ kriyate naiḥsvābhāvyapratiṣiddhatvād-
eva [8] bhāvāḥ [9] sasvabhāvā bhaveyuḥ / sasvabhāvatvādaśūnyāḥ
syuḥ / śūnyatāṃ ca vayaṃ bhāvānāmācakṣmahe nāśūnyatāmity-
adṛṣṭānta evāyamiti [10] /

athavā nirmitakāyāṃ yathā striyāṃ
strīyamityasadgrāham [11] /

[1] So T, supplying *de* before *ltar* in Tucci's text, as Y's translation shows he had
it; *yadvat śūnyena vacanena*, R.
[2] *tvāt tad aśūnyam iti*, R.
[3] Here and several times more in this passages R has *naiḥsvabhāvya*.
[4] R om. *kārṣīr*.
[5] R om. *bhāvānām*.
[6] R inserts *evaṃ* before *yadi*.
[7] *niḥsvabhāvānām*, R.
[8] So T clearly; *°pratiṣedhād eva*, R.
[9] R om *bhāvāḥ*.
[10] T omits *iti* in both occurences here.
[11] e.c.: *striyam*, R; T om. *iyam*. R misprints *asaṅgrāhaṃ;* similarly in the
commentary.

n i r m i t a k a ḥ   p r a t i h a n y ā t [1]   k a s y a c i d e v a ṃ
b h a v e d e t a t // 27 //

athavā yathā [2] kasyacitpuruṣasya nirmitakāyāṃ striyāṃ svabhā-
vaśūnyāyāṃ paramārthataḥ strīyamityasadgrāhaḥ [3] syāt, evaṃ [4]
tasyāṃ tenāsadgrāheṇa sa [5] rāgamutpādayet / [6] tathāgatena vā
tathāgataśrāvakeṇa [7] vā nirmitako nirmitaḥ syāt / tathāgatā-
dhiṣṭhānena vā tathāgataśrāvakādhiṣṭhānena vā [8] sa [9] tasya tama-
sadgrāhaṃ vinivartayet / evameva nirmitakopamena śūnyena
madvacanena [10] nirmitakastrīsadṛśeṣu [11] sarvabhāveṣu niḥsvabhāveṣu
yo 'yaṃ svabhāvagrāhaḥ sa [12] nivartyate / tasmādayamatra dṛṣṭāntaḥ
śūnyatāprasādhanaṃ pratyupapadyamāno [13] netaraḥ /

a t h a v ā   s ā d h y a s a m o   'y a ṃ   h e t u r n a   h i
v i d y a t e   d h v a n e ḥ   s a t t ā /
s a ṃ v y a v a h ā r a ṃ   c a   v a y a ṃ   n ā n a b h y u p a -
g a m y a   k a t h a y ā m a ḥ // 28 //

mā śabdavaditi sādhyasama evāyaṃ hetuḥ / kasmāt / sarva-
bhāvānāṃ naiḥsvabhāvyenāviśiṣṭatvāt [14] / na hi tasya dhvaneḥ
pratītyasamutpannatvāt svabhāvasattā vidyate / tasyāḥ [15] svabhā-
vasattāyā avidyamānatvādyaduktaṃ

śabdena hyatra satā bhaviṣyato vāraṇaṃ tasyeti tadvyāhanyate /

---

[1] C omits *nirmitakaḥ pratihanyāt* in translating the verse.

[2] R om. *yathā*.

[3] *striyam*, R.

[4] T om. *evaṃ*.

[5] R om. *sa*.

[6] R inserts *tad yathā*.

[7] *tacchrāvakeṇa*, R, but C supports T.

[8] T omits the reference to *adhiṣṭhāna*, but C has it.

[9] R om. *sa*.

[10] R om. *mad*.

[11] °*sādṛśyeṣu*, R, which omits *sarvabhāveṣu*.

[12] T om. *ayam* and *sa*.   R adds the gloss, *sa pratiṣidhyate*.

[13] *upapadyamāno* is odd, but occurs again at the end of the commentary on the next verse.

[14] *naiḥsvabhāvyenā*°, R.

[15] T om. *tasyāḥ* and has *evam* or *tathā* instead.

api ca na vayaṃ vyavahārasatyamanabhyupagamya vyavahāra-
satyaṃ [1] pratyākhyāya kathayāmaḥ śūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā iti / na hi
vyavahārasatyamanāgamya śakyā dharmadeśanā kartum / yathoktaṃ

vyavahāramanāśritya paramārtho na deśyate /
paramārthamanāgamya nirvāṇaṃ nādhigamyata iti [2] //

tasmānmadvacanavacchūnyāḥ sarvabhāvāḥ sarvabhāvānāṃ ca
niḥsvabhāvatvamubhayathopapadyamānamiti /

yatpunarbhavatoktaṃ
pratiṣedhapratiṣedho [3] 'pyevamiti mataṃ bhavet tadasadeva
evaṃ tava pratijñā lakṣaṇato dūṣyate na mameti //

atra brūmaḥ /

yadi kācana pratijñā syānme tata eṣa [4]
me bhaveddoṣaḥ /
nāsti ca mama pratijñā tasmānnaivāsti
me doṣaḥ // 29 //

yadi ca kācinmama pratijñā syāt tato mama pratijñālakṣaṇa-
prāptatvātpūrvako [5] doṣo yathā tvayoktastathā [6] mama syāt / na
mama kācidasti pratijñā / tasmāt sarvabhāveṣu śūnyeṣvatyantopa-
śānteṣu prakṛtivivikteṣu kutaḥ pratijñā [7] / kutaḥ pratijñālak-
ṣaṇaprāptiḥ [8] / kutaḥ pratijñālakṣaṇaprāptikṛto [9] doṣaḥ / tatra
yadbhavatoktaṃ [10] tava [11] pratijñālakṣaṇaprāptatvāttavaiva doṣa
iti tanna /

---

[1] T om. *vyavahārasatyaṃ*, which C has as well as R. R transposes *anabhyu-pagamya* and *pratyākhyāya*.

[2] This verse is *MMK*, XXIV, 10.

[3] *pratiṣedhaḥ pratiṣedhyo*, R.

[4] *tatra syāt eṣa*, R; the verse is quoted *MMK*, p. 16, where the editor reads *eva* against the MSS.

[5] R inserts *sa* before *pūrvako*; T may have read *pūrvaṃgamo*.

[6] *tvayoktaṃ bhāvāḥ tathā*, R. T om. *mama*.

[7] R om. *kutaḥ pratijñā*.

[8] T om. *prāptiḥ*, which is shown by C, and it adds *api*.

[9] T seems to have had *°lakṣaṇasambhavaś ca*. Would *°kṛte* be better?

[10] T om. *bhavatā*.

[11] R om. *tava*.

yatpunarbhavatoktaṃ

pratyakṣeṇa hi tāvadyadyupalabhya vinivartayasi [1] bhāvān /

tannāsti pratyakṣaṃ bhāvā yenopalabhyante //

anumānaṃ pratyuktaṃ pratyakṣeṇāgamopamāne ca /

anumānāgamasādhyā ye 'rthā dṛṣṭāntasādhyāśceti //

atra vayaṃ brūmaḥ /

yadi kiṃcidupalabheyaṃ [2] pravartayeyaṃ
nivartayeyaṃ vā /
pratyakṣādibhirarthaistadabhāvānme 'nu-
pālambhaḥ // 30 //

yadyahaṃ kaṃcidarthamupalabheyaṃ [3] pratyakṣānumānopamā-
nāgamaiścaturbhiḥ [4] pramāṇaiścaturṇāṃ vā pramāṇānāmanyata-
mena [5], ata eva [6] pravartayeyaṃ vā nivartayeyaṃ vā / yathārtham-
evāhaṃ kaṃcinnopalabhe[7] tasmānna pravartayāmi na nivartayāmi /
tatraivaṃ sati yo bhavatopālambha ukto yadi pratyakṣādīnāṃ
pramāṇānāmanyatamenopalabhya bhāvānvinivartayasi [8] nanu tāni [9]
pramāṇāni na santi taiśca pramāṇairapi [10] gamyā arthā na santīti[11]
sa me bhavatyevānupalambhaḥ /

kiṃ cānyat /

yadi ca pramāṇataste [12] teṣāṃ teṣāṃ
prasiddhirarthānām /

---

[1] R om *vi.*

[2] *upalabheya* would be better here and in the commentary; the verse is quoted
MMK, p. 16.

[3] *kiṃcid,* R.

[4] R om. *mānāgamaiś ca.*

[5] *anyatamānyatamena,* R.

[6] *evaṃ,* R.

[7] R's MS. omits *nivartayeyaṃ vā / yathā,* and then has *artham evāhaṃ kiṃcin
nopalabhate.*

[8] R adds *iti.*

[9] *bhavatoktāni,* R.

[10] T om. *pramāṇair api.*

[11] R om. *na santi.*

[12] R om. *te ;* T omits one *teṣāṃ* and adds *eva,* as if reading *pramāṇata eva bhavatas
teṣām.*

teṣāṃ punaḥ prasiddhiṃ brūhi kathaṃ
te¹ pramāṇānām // 31 //

yadi ca pramāṇatasteṣāṃ² teṣāmarthānām prameyāṇāṃ prasid-
dhiṃ³ manyase yathā mānairmeyānām⁴, teṣāmidānīm pratya-
kṣānumānopamānāgamānāṃ caturṇāṃ pramāṇānāṃ kutaḥ prasid-
dhiḥ / yadi tāvannispramāṇānāṃ pramāṇānāṃ syātprasiddhiḥ⁵,
pramāṇato 'rthānāṃ prasiddhiriti hīyate pratijñā / tathāpi⁶ /

anyairyadi pramāṇaiḥ pramāṇasiddhir-
bhavettadanavasthā⁷ /

yadi punarmanyase pramāṇaiḥ prameyāṇāṃ prasiddhisteṣāṃ
pramāṇānāmanyaiḥ pramāṇaiḥ prasiddhirevamanavasthāprasaṅ-
gaḥ⁸ / anavasthāprasaṅge ko doṣaḥ⁹ /

nādeḥ siddhistatrāsti naiva madhyasya
nāntasya // 32 //

¹⁰anavasthāprasaṅga ādeḥ siddhirnāsti / kiṃ kāraṇam / teṣāmapi

---

¹ teṣām, R.

² T omits one teṣām and has eva instead.

³ R om. pra.

⁴ R inserts tathā.

⁵ So R, after substituting pramāṇānām for pramāṇair and cutting out an inter-
polation which consists of 32 cd and the first words of the commentary on it.
C is word for word the same as the text, but T, which is corrupt at the end, reads
yadi tāvat teṣāṃ pramāṇānām anyaiḥ pramāṇaiḥ prasiddhiḥ syāt, or prasiddhir na
syāt, according as one reads yod par ḥgrub la or med par ḥgrub la. The argument
is that according to the Naiyāyika system the principle is that arthas can only be
proved by pramāṇas; but the pramāṇas are themselves arthas, and therefore if they
are not proved by other pramāṇas, the principle does not hold. But this is
repeated under kārikā 33, and the text seems to have already been out of order by
C's time, as it has the argument of 32 ab in the commentary under 30 and does not
treat 32 as a kārikā. It might therefore be better to omit the entire sentence.
Note that Vātsyāyana in the opening of his bhāṣya on the Nyāyasūtras puts the
function of the pramāṇas in different language, so that his statements could not be
twisted in the way Nāgārjuna twists his opponent's views here.

⁶ athāpi, T.

⁷ e.c.: bhavaty anavasthā, R, one mora short. The optative is required, but T
gives no help for the missing syllable.

⁸ R om. evam; ity evam would be better.

⁹ T adds tatraivaṃ brūmaḥ.

¹⁰ R adds asya at the beginning.

hi pramāṇānāmanyaiḥ pramāṇaiḥ prasiddhisteṣāmanyairiti[1] nāsty-
ādiḥ / āderasadbhāvāt kuto madhyam kuto 'ntaḥ / tasmātteṣām
pramāṇānāmanyaiḥ pramāṇaiḥ prasiddhiriti yaduktam tannopa-
padyata[2] iti /

teṣāmatha   pramāṇairvinā   prasiddhirvi-
hīyate   vādaḥ /
vaiṣamikatvaṃ   tasminviśeṣahetuśca   vak-
tavyaḥ // 33 //

atha manyase teṣām pramāṇānām vinā pramāṇaiḥ[3] prasiddhiḥ,
prameyāṇām punararthānām pramāṇaiḥ prasiddhiriti, evam sati
yaste vādaḥ pramāṇaiḥ prasiddhirarthānām iti sa[4] hīyate / vaiṣa-
mikatvam ca bhavati keṣāṃcidarthānām pramāṇaiḥ prasiddhiḥ
keṣāṃcinneti / viśeṣahetuśca vaktavyo yena hetunā keṣāṃcidarthā-
nām pramāṇaiḥ prasiddhiḥ keṣāṃcinneti / sa ca nopadiṣṭaḥ[5] /
tasmādiyamapi kalpanā nopapanneti[6] /

atrāha / pramāṇānyeva[7] svātmānam parātmānam ca prasā-
dhayanti / yathoktam

dyotayati svātmānam yathā hutāśastathā parātmānam /
svaparātmānāvevam prasādhayanti pramāṇānīti //
yathāgniḥ svātmānam parātmānam ca prakāśayati tathaiva pra-
māṇāni prasādhayanti[8] svātmānam parātmānam ceti /

atrocyate /

viṣamopanyāso   'yaṃ   na   hyātmānam   pra-
kāśayatyagniḥ /
na   hi   tasyānupalabdhirdṛṣṭā   tamasīva
kumbhasya // 34 //

---

[1] T has *atra* for *iti*.
[2] R om. iti *yad uktaṃ tan*, but C supports T.
[3] T adds *api*.
[4] R om. *sa*.
[5] *sā ca nopadiṣṭā*, R.
[6] T om. *iyam* and *iti*.
[7] R adds *mama*.
[8] R omits from *iti* at the end of the verse to *prasādhayanti* inclusive, having simply *param iva*.

viṣama evopanyāso 'gnivat pramāṇāni svātmānaṃ ca prasādha-
yanti parātmānaṃ ca prasādhayantīti [1] / na hyagnirātmānaṃ
prakāśayati [2] / yathā prāgevāgnināprakāśitastamasi kumbho nopala-
bhyate 'thottarakālamupalabhyate [3] 'gninā prakāśitaḥ san, evameva
yadyaprakāśitaḥ prāgagnistamasi syād[4]uttarakālamagneḥ prakā-
śanaṃ syāt, ataḥ svātmānaṃ prakāśayet / na caitadevam [5] / tas-
mādiyamapi kalpanā nopapadyata iti [6] /

kiṃ cānyat /

yadi ca [7] svātmānamayaṃ tvadvacanena
prakāśayatyagniḥ /
paramiva nanvātmānaṃ paridhakṣyatyapi
hutāśaḥ [8] // 35 //

yadi ca tvadvacanena yathā parātmānaṃ prakāśayatyagnir-
evameva svātmānamapi prakāśayati [9], nanu yathā parātmānaṃ
dahatyevameva svātmānamapi dhakṣyati [10] / na caitadevam / tatra
yaduktaṃ parātmānamiva svātmānamapi [11] prakāśayatyagnirit
tanna /

kiṃ cānyat /

yadi ca svaparātmānau tvadvacanena
prakāśayatyagniḥ /
pracchādayiṣyati tamaḥ svaparātmānaui
hutāśa iva [12] // 36 //

yadi ca bhavato matena svaparātmānau prakāśayatyagniḥ,

---

[1] T has merely svaparātmānau prasādhayantīti.

[2] R adds yadi hi at the beginning.

[3] T om. atha.

[4] yady agninā na prakāśitaḥ prāg agnir naḥ syād, R.

[5] R om. ca.

[6] T om. tasmād and iti, R nopapadyanta.

[7] R omits ca required by the metre; cf. the commentary.

[8] So R, leaving the line two morae short; T does not give any extra word. See
p. 3 supra.

[9] R adds agnir iti.

[10] R adds iti.

[11] R om. api.

[12] Cf. MMK, VII, 12.

nanvidānīṃ tatpratipakṣabhūtaṃ tamo[1] 'pi svaparātmānau chā-
dayet / na caitad dṛṣṭam[2] / tatra yaduktaṃ svaparātmānau prakā-
śayatyagniriti tanna /

kiṃ cānyat /

nāsti tamaśca jvalane yatra ca tiṣṭhati
parātmani[3] jvalanaḥ /
kurute kathaṃ prakāśaṃ sa hi prakāśo
'ndhakāravadhaḥ // 37 //

iha cāgnau nāsti tamo nāpi ca yatrāgnistatrāsti tamaḥ / prakāśaśca
nāma tamasaḥ pratighātaḥ / yasmāccāgnau[4] nāsti tamo nāpi ca
yatrāgnistatrāsti tamaḥ, tatra kasya[5] tamasaḥ pratighātamagniḥ
karoti yasya pratighātādagniḥ[6] svaparātmānau prakāśayatīti[7] /

atrāha[8] / nanu[9] yasmādevaṃ[10] nāgnau tamo 'sti nāpi yatrāgnis-
tatra tamo 'sti, tasmādeva[11] svaparātmānau na prakāśayatyagniḥ
kutaḥ[12] / tena hyutpadyamānenaivāgninā tamasaḥ pratighātaḥ[13] /
tasmānnāgnau tamo 'sti nāpi yatrāgnistatra tamo 'sti, yasmādut-
padyamāna evobhayaṃ prakāśayatyagniḥ svātmānaṃ parātmānaṃ
ceti / atrocyate /

utpadyamāna eva prakāśayatyagnirity-
asadvādaḥ /

---

[1] nanv idānīṃ pratipakṣabhūtatamo, R; T omits idānīṃ and tamo; C has tamo.

[2] So C; naitad iṣṭam, R; na caitad evam, T.

[3] sadātmani, R; gźan na (= paratra), T; " and in the place where (fire) itself and another are present ", C.   For the verse cf. MMK, VII, 9.

[4] e.c.; tasmāc, T; " if ", C.   R omits from yasmāc to tatrāsti tamaḥ inclusive.

[5] katham asya, R.

[6] R om. agniḥ.

[7] T om. iti.

[8] R om. atra.

[9] R substitutes yat for nanu.

[10] T omits evam, which C has.

[11] yasmād evam, R; T has dropped a word and may have had yasmād eva or tasmād eva, but the latter alone is possible.

[12] R puts kutaḥ at the end of next sentence, but T shows a question and C has no negative, so that the text reading alone meets the case.

[13] pratigrahaḥ, R.

utpadyamāna   eva   prāpnoti   tamo   na   hi
hutāśaḥ[1] // 38 //

ayamagnirutpadyamāna eva prakāśayati svātmānaṃ parātmānaṃ
ceti nāyamupapadyate vādaḥ / kasmāt / na hyutpadyamāna
evāgnistamaḥ prāpnoti, aprāptatvānnaivopahanti tamasaścānupa-
ghātānnāsti prakāśaḥ /

kiṃ cānyat /

aprāpto 'pi jvalano yadi vā punarandha-
kāramupahanyāt /
sarveṣu   lokadhātuṣu   tamo   'yamiha[2]
saṃsthito   hānyat[3] // 39 //

athāpi manyase 'prāpto 'pyagnirandhakāramupahantīti nanv-
idānīmiha[4] saṃsthito 'gniḥ sarvalokadhātusthamupahaniṣyati
tamastulyamayamaprāptaḥ[5] / na caitadevaṃ dṛṣṭam[6] / tasmād-
aprāpyaivāgnirandhakāramupahantīti yadiṣṭaṃ tanna /

kiṃ cānyat /

yadi svataśca[7]   pramāṇasiddhiranapekṣya
tava[8]   prameyāṇi /
bhavati   pramāṇasiddhirna   parāpekṣā
svataḥ   siddhiḥ[9] // 40 //

yadi cāgnivat svataḥ pramāṇasiddhiriti manyase, anapekṣyāpi
prameyānarthān[10] pramāṇānāṃ prasiddhirbhaviṣyati[11] / kiṃ kāra-

---

[1] Cf. MMK, VII, 10.
[2] *ya iha*, T.
[3] *saṃsthita upahanyāt*, R, against the metre.   Cf. MMK, VII, 11, for the verse.
[4] T om. *idānīm*.
[5] *tulyāyām aprāptaḥ*, R; this use of *tulyam* seems to have no parallel, but there is no other way of reconstructing T from R, as the palaeographically better *tulyo 'yam* is hardly possible.
[6] T om. *dṛṣṭam*, which C has.
[7] *yadi ca svataḥ*, R, against the metre.
[8] *te*, R, against the metre.
[9] *parāpekṣā hi siddhir iti*, R; C, which apparently misunderstood the verse, has *svataḥ* twice. Cf. with the arguments of verses 40-50, MMK, x, 8-12.
[10] *prameyāṇi*, R.
[11] R om. *pra* and adds *iti* at the end.

ṇam / na hi svataḥ siddhiḥ[1] paramapekṣate / athāpekṣate na svataḥ siddhiḥ[2] /

atrāha yadi nāpekṣante prameyānarthān pramāṇāni ko doṣo bhaviṣyatīti / atrocyate /

a n a p e k ṣ y a   h i   p r a m e y ā n a r t h ā n   y a d i   t e
p r a m ā ṇ a s i d d h i r i t i[3] /
n a   b h a v a n t i   k a s y a c i d e v a m i m ā n i   t ā n i[4]
p r a m ā ṇ ā n i // 41 //

yadi prameyānarthānanapekṣa prasiddhirbhavati[5] pramāṇānām-ityevaṃ tānīmāni[6] pramāṇāni na kasyacit pramāṇāni[7] bhavanti / evaṃ doṣaḥ / atha kasyacidbhavanti[8] pramāṇāni naivedānīmana-pekṣya prameyānarthān pramāṇāni bhavanti /

a t h a   m a t a m a p e k ṣ y a   s i d d h i s t e ṣ ā m i t y a t r a
b h a v a t i   k o   d o ṣ a ḥ[9] /
s i d d h a s y a   s ā d h a n a ṃ   s y ā n n ā s i d d h o   ʻp e-
k ṣ a t e   h y a n y a t // 42 //

athāpi matamapekṣya prameyānarthān pramāṇānāṃ siddhir-bhavatīti, evaṃ[10] siddhasya pramāṇacatuṣṭayasya sādhanaṃ bha-vati[11] / kiṃ kāraṇam[12] / na hyasiddhasyārthasyāpekṣaṇam bhavati / na hyasiddho devadattaḥ kaṃcidarthamapekṣate / na ca siddhasya sādhanamiṣṭaṃ kṛtasya karaṇānupapatteriti[13] /

---

[1] R om. *siddhiḥ.*

[2] *prasiddhiḥ*, R.

[3] e.c.; *pramāṇasiddhir bhavati*, R, against the metre. T does not show *iti*, but cf. the commentary.

[4] R om. *tāni.*

[5] *siddhir*, R.

[6] R om. *evaṃ*; T om. *tāni* and adds *te* instead.

[7] T adds *api.*

[8] T adds *arthasya* after *kasyacid*, but C evidently did not have it, as it under-stands *kasyacid* to mean " of a certain man ".

[9] *iti a bhavato ko doṣaḥ*, R.

[10] R adds *hi sati* and T *te.*

[11] R adds *iti.*

[12] T omits *kiṃ kāraṇam*, which C has.

[13] *kāraraṇam anupa°*, R. T om. *iti.*

kiṃ cānyat /

sidhyanti hi prameyānyapekṣya yadi sarva-
thā pramāṇāni/
bhavati prameyasiddhirnāpekṣyaiva[1] pra-
māṇāni // 43 //

yadi prameyānyapekṣya pramāṇāni sidhyanti nedānīṃ pra-
māṇānyapekṣya prameyāṇi sidhyanti / kiṃ kāraṇam / na hi
sādhyaṃ sādhanaṃ sādhayati sādhanāni ca kila prameyāṇāṃ
pramāṇāni [2] /

kiṃ cānyat /

yadi ca prameyasiddhirnāpekṣyaiva[3]
bhavati pramāṇāni/
kiṃ te pramāṇasiddhyā tani yadarthaṃ
prasiddhaṃ tat // 44 //

yadi ca manyase 'napekṣyaiva pramāṇāni prameyāṇāṃ prasid-
dhirbhavatīti kimidānīṃ[4] te pramāṇasiddhyā paryanviṣṭayā / kiṃ
kāraṇam / yadarthaṃ hi tāni pramāṇāni paryanviṣyeran te prameyā
arthā vināpi[5] pramāṇaiḥ siddhāḥ / tatra kiṃ[6] pramāṇaiḥ kṛtyam /

atha tu pramāṇasiddhirbhavatyape-
kṣyaiva te prameyāṇi/
vyatyaya evaṃ sati te dhruvaṃ pra-
māṇaprameyāṇām // 45 //

athāpi[7] manyase 'pekṣyaiva prameyānarthān pramāṇāni bhavan-
tīti[8] mā bhūtpūrvoktadoṣa iti kṛtvā, evaṃ te sati vyatyayaḥ

---

[1] *anapekṣyaiva*, R, against the metre and commentary.

[2] *pramāṇānāṃ prameyāṇi*, T, but C also has the text.

[3] *anapekṣyaiva*, R, against the metre, but *nāpekṣya* here must be understood as
a compound equivalent to *anapekṣya*.

[4] *°r bhavatīti kim i°* are apparently missing in R's MS. (Owing to damage at
the end of the line?)

[5] R om. *api*.

[6] T adds *te*, which is not in C.

[7] R om. *api*.

[8] R omits *iti* and adds *evaṃ hi sati*.

pramāṇaprameyāṇāṃ bhavati / pramāṇāni te prameyāṇi bhavanti
prameyaiḥ sādhitatvāt [1] / prameyāṇi ca pramāṇāni [2] bhavanti
pramāṇānāṃ sādhakatvāt /

atha te pramāṇasiddhyā prameyasiddhiḥ
prameyasiddhyā ca /
bhavati pramāṇasiddhirnāstyubhayasyāpi
te siddhiḥ // 46 //

atha manyase pramāṇasiddhyā prameyasiddhirbhavati pramāṇā-
pekṣatvāt [3] prameyasiddhyā ca pramāṇasiddhirbhavati prameyā-
pekṣatvāditi, evaṃ te satyubhayasyāpi siddhirna bhavati [4] / kiṃ
kāraṇam [5] /

sidhyanti hi pramāṇairyadi prameyāṇi
tāni taireva /
sādhyāni ca prameyaistāni kathaṃ sā-
dhayiṣyanti // 47 //

yadi hi pramāṇaiḥ prameyāṇi sidhyanti tāni ca [6] pramāṇāni
taireva prameyaiḥ sādhayitavyāni nanvasiddheṣu prameyeṣu kāra-
ṇasyāsiddhatvādasiddhāni kathaṃ sādhayiṣyanti prameyāṇi [7] /

sidhyanti ca prameyairyadi pramāṇāni
tāni taireva /
sādhyāni ca pramāṇaistāni [8] kathaṃ
sādhayiṣyanti // 48 //

yadi ca [9] prameyaiḥ pramāṇāni sidhyanti tāni ca prameyāṇi
taireva pramāṇaiḥ sādhayitavyāni [10] nanvasiddheṣu pramāṇeṣu
kāraṇasyāsiddhatvādasiddhāni kathaṃ sādhayiṣyanti pramāṇāni /

---

[1] *prasādhitatvāt*, T.
[2] R interchanges *prameyāṇi* and *pramāṇāni.*
[3] T may read *pramāṇāpekṣayā*, and similarly at the end of the next clause.
[4] R om. *bhavati.*
[5] R om. *kiṃ kāra.*
[6] R om. *ca.*
[7] R adds *iti.*
[8] *prameyais tāni*, R.
[9] R om. *ca.*
[10] R adds *iti.*

pitrā yadyutpādyaḥ putro yadi tena
caiva putreṇa/
utpādyaḥ sa yadi pitā vada tatrotpā-
dayati kaḥ kam // 49 //

yathāpi nāma [1] kaścid brūyātpitrā putra utpādanīyaḥ sa ca pitā tenaiva [2] putreṇotpādanīya iti, tatredānīm [3] brūhi kena ka utpādayitavya iti [4] / tathaiva khalu [5] bhavān bravīti pramāṇaiḥ prameyāṇi sādhayitavyāni tānyeva ca punaḥ [6] pramāṇāni taireva [7] prameyairiti [8], tatredānīm [9] te katamaiḥ katamāni sādhayitavyāni [10] /

kaśca pitā kaḥ putrastatra tvaṃ brūhi [11]
tāvubhāvapi ca/
pitṛputralakṣaṇadharau yato bhavati no
'tra saṃdehaḥ [12] // 50 //

tayośca pūrvopadiṣṭayoḥ pitṛputrayoḥ [13] kataraḥ putraḥ kataraḥ pitā / ubhāvapi tāvutpādakatvāt pitṛlakṣaṇadharāvutpādyatvācca putralakṣaṇadharau / atra naḥ saṃdeho bhavati katarastatra pitā kataraḥ [14] putra iti / evameva yānyetāni bhavataḥ pramāṇaprameyāṇi tatra katarāṇi pramāṇāni katarāṇi prameyāṇi / ubhayānyapi hyetāni sādhakatvāt [15] pramāṇāni [16] sādhyatvāt prameyāṇi [17] / atra naḥ

[1] T omits *nāma*, and R adds *yad* before *yathāpi*.
[2] R om. *tenaiva*.
[3] T om. *idānīm*.
[4] R om. *iti*.
[5] T om *khalu*.
[6] T om. *ca* or *punaḥ*.
[7] R om. *r eva*.
[8] R om. *iti*, and T adds *sādhayitavyāni* before it.
[9] T om. *idānīm*.
[10] *prasādhayitavyāni*, T.
[11] R adds *katham*.
[12] *yato na putrasaṃdehaḥ*, R, against the metre and commentary; T has *tato* for *yato*.
[13] *pitāputrayoḥ vada*, R.
[14] R adds *tatra*.
[15] R omits *sādhakatvāt*, and T has *prasādhakatvāt*.
[16] R adds *tāni prameyāṇi*.
[17] R adds *iti*.

saṃdeho bhavati katarāṇyatra[1] pramāṇāni katarāṇi prameyāṇīti[2] /

naiva   svataḥ   prasiddhirna   parasparataḥ
parapramāṇairvā[3] /
na[4]   bhavati   na   ca   prameyairna   cāpy-
akasmāt   pramāṇānām // 51 //

na svataḥ prasiddhiḥ pratyakṣasya tenaiva pratyakṣeṇa, anumā-
nasya tenaivānumānena, upamānasya tenaivopamānena, āgamasya
tenaivāgamena / nāpi parasparataḥ pratyakṣasyānumānopamānā-
gamaiḥ, anumānasya pratyakṣopamānāgamaiḥ, upamānasya pra-
tyakṣānumānāgamaiḥ, āgamasya pratyakṣānumānopamānaiḥ / nāpi
pratyakṣānumānopamānāgamānāmanyaiḥ[5] pratyakṣānumānopamā-
nāgamairyathāsvam / nāpi prameyaiḥ samastavyastaiḥ svaviṣayapa-
raviṣayasaṃgṛhītaiḥ[6] / nāpyakasmāt / nāpi[7] samuccayenaiteṣām[8]
kāraṇānāṃ pūrvoddiṣṭānāṃ viṃśattriṃśaccatvāriṃśatṣaṭviṃśater-
vā[9] / tatra yaduktaṃ[10] pramāṇādhigamyatvāt prameyāṇāṃ bhā-
vānāṃ santi ca te[11] prameyā bhāvāstāni ca pramāṇāni yaiste[12]
pramāṇaiḥ prameyā bhāvāḥ[13] samadhigatā iti tanna /

yatpunarbhavatoktam /
kuśalānāṃ dharmāṇāṃ dharmāvasthāvidaśca manyante /
kuśalaṃ janāḥ svabhāvaṃ[14] śeṣeṣvapyeṣa viniyoga iti //
atra brūmaḥ /

[1] T om. *atra*.
[2] T om. *iti*.
[3] R om. *para*.
[4] R om. *na*.
[5] *°gamād anyaiḥ*, R.
[6] *viṣa[ya]tāgṛhītaiḥ*, R.
[7] *nāsti*, R.
[8] Both C and T take *nāpi samuccayena* as a seperate clause and evidently began
the next one with *naiteṣām*, but this seems bad sense.
[9] *°viṃśatir vā*, R.   If C and T's division is accepted, one should read *viṃśati-
bhir* (palaeographically better than *°viṃśatyā*).
[10] T adds *bhavatā*.
[11] R has *tu* for *te*.
[12] R reads *tu* for *te*.
[13] R adds *santaś ca bhāvāḥ*.
[14] *janasvabhāvaṃ manyante*, R.

kuśalānāṃ dharmāṇāṃ dharmāvasthāvido
bruvanti yadi [1]/
kuśalam [2] svabhāvamevaṃ pravibhāge-
nābhidheyaḥ syāt // 52 //

kuśalānāṃ dharmāṇāṃ dharmāvasthāvidaḥ kuśalaṃ svabhā-
vaṃ [3] manyante / sa ca bhavatā pravibhāgenopadeṣṭavyaḥ syāt /
ayaṃ sa kuśalaḥ svabhāvaḥ / ime te kuśalā dharmāḥ [4] / idaṃ
tatkuśalaṃ vijñānam / ayaṃ sa [5] kuśalavijñānasvabhāvaḥ / evaṃ
sarveṣām / na caitadevaṃ dṛṣṭam [6] / tasmādyaduktaṃ yathāsvam-
upadiṣṭaḥ [7] svabhāvo dharmāṇāmiti tanna /
kiṃ cānyat /

yadi ca pratītya kuśalaḥ svabhāva ut-
padyate sa kuśalānām/
dharmāṇāṃ parabhāvaḥ svabhāva evaṃ [8]
kathaṃ bhavati // 53 //

yadi ca kuśalānāṃ dharmāṇāṃ svabhāvo hetupratyayasāmagrīṃ
pratītyotpadyate sa [9] parabhāvādutpannaḥ kuśalānāṃ dharmāṇāṃ
kathaṃ svabhāvo bhavati / evamevākuśalaprabhṛtīnām [10] / tatra
yaduktaṃ kuśalānāṃ [11] dharmāṇāṃ kuśalaḥ svabhāvo 'pyupa-
diṣṭaḥ [12], evamakuśalādīnāṃ cākuśalādiriti [13] tanna /
kiṃ cānyat /

---

[1] *bruvate yat*, R, against the metre; the text follows the indications of C, but
T has *gaṅ* (*yat*) and an optative would be better. Possibly therefore *bruvīran yat*.
[2] *kuśala*, R.
[3] *janasvabhāvaṃ*, R.
[4] R adds *iti*.
[5] R and T omit *sa*, required by the context.
[6] *na caitad upadiṣṭam*, T; but C as in text and R.
[7] C and R omit *yathāsvam*, which seems required.
[8] *eva*, R.
[9] R om. *sa*.
[10] T adds something like *yuktam*.
[11] *kuśalāvyākṛtānāṃ na*, R.
[12] R om. *'py u.*
[13] R omits *ca*, and T adds *svabhāva evopadiṣṭaḥ*.

atha na pratītya kiṃcitsvabhāva utpa-
dyate sa kuśalānām/
dharmāṇāmevaṃ syādvāso na brahmaca-
ryasya[1] // 54 //

atha manyase na kiṃcitpratītya kuśalānāṃ dharmāṇāṃ kuśalaḥ[2] svabhāva utpadyate, evamakuśalānāṃ dharmāṇāmakuśalaḥ, avyā-kṛtānāmavyākṛta[3] iti, evam satyabrahmacaryavāso bhavati / kiṃ kāraṇam / pratītyasamutpādasya hyevaṃ sati pratyākhyānaṃ bhavati / pratītyasamutpādasya pratyākhyānāt pratītyasamut-pādadarśana[4]pratyākhyānaṃ bhavati / na hyavidyamānasya pra-tītyasamutpādasya darśanamupapadyamānaṃ bhavati / asati pra-tītyasamutpādadarśane dharmadarśanaṃ na bhavati / uktaṃ hi bhagavatā yo hi bhikṣavaḥ pratītyasamutpādaṃ paśyati sa dharmaṃ paśyatīti[5] / dharmadarśanābhāvād brahmacaryavāsābhāvaḥ /

athavā pratītyasamutpādapratyākhyānādduḥkhasamudayapratyā-khyānaṃ bhavati / pratītyasamutpādo hi duḥkhasya samudayaḥ / duḥkhasamudayasya pratyākhyānādduḥkhapratyākhyānaṃ bha-vati / asati hi samudaye tatkuto[6] duḥkhaṃ samudeṣyati / duḥkha-pratyākhyānāt[7] samudayapratyākhyānācca duḥkhanirodhasya pra-tyākhyānaṃ bhavati[8] / asati hi duḥkhasamudaye[9] kasya prahā-ṇānnirodho bhaviṣyati / [duḥkhanirodhapratyākhyānānmārgasya pratyākhyānaṃ bhavati][10] / asati hi duḥkhanirodhe kasya prāptaye mārge bhaviṣyati duḥkhanirodhagāmī / evaṃ caturṇām-āryasatyānāmabhāvaḥ / teṣāmabhāvāc[11]chrāmaṇyaphalābhāvaḥ /

[1] Cf. MMK, xxiv, 18-30, for this passage.
[2] *kuśala*, R.
[3] T abridges the two last clauses to *evaṃ cākuśalādīnām.*
[4] *ºdarśanaṃ*, R; should it be *ºdarśanasya?*
[5] R om. *iti.* Quotation from the *Śālistambasūtra.*
[6] T om. *tat.*
[7] R om. *pratyākhyānāt.*
[8] R om. *bhavati.*
[9] T takes this compound as a dvandva.
[10] Neither C, T, nor R have this sentence, which is essential to the context.
[11] R omits *ºḥ teṣām abhāvāº*, and has *ºvaº* only instead.

satyadarśanācchrāmaṇya[1]phalāni hi samadhigamyante [2] / śrāma-
ṇyaphalānāmabhāvādabrahmacaryavāsa iti [3] /

kiṃ cānyat /

nādharmo   dharmo   vā   saṃvyavahārāśca
laukikā   na   syuḥ /
nityāśca   sasvabhāvāḥ [4]   syurnityatvād-
ahetumataḥ // 55 //

evaṃ sati pratītyasamutpādaṃ pratyācakṣāṇasya bhavataḥ ko
doṣaḥ prasajyate / dharmo na bhavati / adharmo na bhavati /
saṃvyavahārāśca laukikā na bhavanti [5] / kiṃ kāraṇam / pratītyasam-
utpannaṃ hyetatsarvamasati [6] pratītyasamutpāde kuto bha-
viṣyati [7] / api ca sasvabhāvo [8] 'pratītyasamutpanno nirhetuko
nityaḥ syāt / kiṃ kāraṇam [9] / nirhetukā hi bhāvā [10] nityāḥ / [11]sa eva
cābrahmacaryavāsaḥ prasajyeta [12] / svasiddhāntavirodhaśca [13] /
kiṃ kāraṇam / anityā hi bhagavatā sarve saṃskārā nirdiṣṭāḥ / te
sasvabhāvanityatvānnityā [14] hi bhavanti /

evamakuśa[15]leṣvavyākṛteṣu   nairyāṇikā-
diṣu [16]   ca   doṣaḥ /
tasmātsarvaṃ   saṃskṛtamasaṃskṛtaṃ   te
bhavatyeva [17] // 56 //

---

[1] °darśanādiśrāma°, R.
[2] R om. *hi sama.*
[3] T om. *iti.*
[4] So C, rightly as the commentary shows; *sarvabhāvāḥ*, R; *sarvadharmāḥ*, T.
For the first line cf. MMK, XXIV, 33-36.
[5] *saṃbhavanti*, R.
[6] T adds *tasmin.*
[7] *saṃbhaviṣyati*, T possibly.
[8] C, T and R agree on the reading; sc. *bhāvaḥ?*
[9] T omits *kiṃ kāraṇam*, but C shows it.
[10] T omits *bhāvā*, which C has.
[11] R adds *tatra.*
[12] T omits *prasajyeta*, and R puts a daṇḍa before it.
[13] T om. *sva*, and R om. *ca.*
[14] R omits *sa*, which C and T have.
[15] *eṣa cākuśa°*, R, against the metre.
[16] *nairyāṇadiṣu*, R.
[17] *evam*, R.

yaścaiṣa kuśaleṣu dharmeṣu [1] nirdiṣṭaḥ kalpaḥ sa evākuśaleṣu,
sa evāvyākṛteṣu, sa eva nairyāṇikaprabhṛtiṣu [2] / tasmātte [3] sarvam-
idaṃ saṃskṛtamasaṃskṛtaṃ sampadyate / kiṃ kāraṇam / hetau
hyasatyutpādasthitibhaṅgā na bhavanti / utpādasthitibhaṅgeṣv-
asatsu [4] saṃskṛtalakṣaṇābhāvāt sarvaṃ saṃskṛtamasaṃskṛtaṃ sam-
padyate / tatra yaduktaṃ kuśalādīnāṃ bhāvānāṃ svabhāvasadbhā-
vādaśūnyāḥ sarvabhāvā iti tanna /

yatpunarbhavatoktaṃ
yadi ca na bhavetsvabhāvo dharmāṇāṃ niḥsvabhāva ityeva [5] /
nāmāpi bhavennaivam [6] nāma hi nirvastukaṃ nāstīti //
atra brūmaḥ [7] /

yaḥ   sadhbhūtaṃ   nāmātra [8]   brūyātsa-
svabhāva   ityevam /
bhavatā   prativaktavyo   nāma   brūmaśca
na   vayaṃ   tat // 57 //

yo nāmātra [9] sadbhūtaṃ brūyātsasvabhāva iti sa bhavatā
prativaktavyaḥ syāt / yasya sadbhūtaṃ [10] nāma svabhāvasya
tasmāttenāpi svabhāvena sadbhūtena bhavitavyam [11] / na hyasad-
bhūtasya svabhāvasya [12] sadbhūtaṃ nāma bhavatīti [13] / na punar-
vayaṃ nāma sadbhūtaṃ brūmaḥ / tadapi hi bhāvasvabhāvasyā-

---

[1] R omits *dharmeṣu*, which C also has.

[2] R adds *doṣaḥ*, not in C or T; T adds *api* or *ca*.

[3] R om. *te*.

[4] *teṣv asatsu*, T.

[5] *bhāvānāṃ na svabhāva ity evam*, R.

[6] *bhaved evam*, R.

[7] R om. *iti / atra brūmaḥ*.

[8] e.c.; R and T om. *atra*.

[9] R om. *atra*.

[10] *sadbhūta*, R.

[11] This is R's version of the sentence, but *tasmāt* is clumsy; C simplifies and gives
no help; T had something like *yady asadbhūto nāmavataḥ svabhāvas tasmāt tenāpi
nāmnāsadbhūtasvabhāvena bhavitavyam*.

[12] T om. *svabhāvasya*.

[13] T om. *iti*.

bhāvānnāma niḥsvabhāvam [1], tasmācchūnyam [2], śūnyatvādasad-
bhūtam / tatra yadbhavatoktaṃ nāmasadbhāvātsadbhūtaḥ svabhāva
iti tanna /

   kiṃ cānyat /

   nāmāsaditi ca yadidaṃ tatkiṃ nu sato
   bhavatyutāpyasataḥ [3] /
   yadi hi sato yadyasato dvidhāpi te
   hīyate vādaḥ // 58 //

yaccaitannāmāsaditi tatkiṃ sato 'sato vā [4] / yadi hi satas tan-
nāma [5] yadyasata ubhayathāpi pratijñā hīyate / tatra yadi tāvatsato
nāmāsaditi [6] pratijñā hīyate / na hīdānīṃ tadasadidānīṃ sat /
athāsato 'saditi [7] nāma [8], asadbhūtasya nāma na bhavati [9] /
tasmādyā pratijñā nāmnaḥ [10] sadbhūtaḥ svabhāva iti sā hinā /
   kiṃ cānyat /

   sarveṣāṃ bhāvānāṃ śūnyatvaṃ copa-
   pāditaṃ pūrvam /
   sa upālambhastasmādbhāvatyayaṃ cā-
   pratijñāyāḥ // 59 //

iha cāsmābhiḥ pūrvameva sarveṣāṃ bhāvānāṃ vistarataḥ
śūnyatvamupapāditam / tatra prāṅ nāmno 'pi śūnyatvamuktam /
sa bhavānaśūnyatvam [11] parigṛhya parivṛtto vaktuṃ yadi bhāvānāṃ

---

   [1] R omits *bhāva* before *svabhāva* and reads *niḥsvabhāvatvāt.*
   [2] R om. *tasmāc*, but should the reading be *niḥsvabhāvatvāc*, as suggested by the readings in the previous note?
   [3] e.c.; *utāsataḥ*, R, against the metre; the alternative *uta vāsataḥ* would also be unmetrical.
   [4] *sataḥ asataḥ*, R.
   [5] R om. *tan.*
   [6] *tāvat sat | asad iti*, R.
   [7] *athāsat | asad iti*, R.
   [8] R inserts *yā pratijñā* wrongly here instead of in the next sentence.
   [9] R adds *astitvasvabhāva iti.*
   [10] R om. *yā pratijñā nāmnaḥ.*
   [11] *sambhavaṃ aśūnyatvam*, R; C as in text; T omits the entire sentence.

svabhāvo na syādasvabhāva iti nāmāpīdaṃ na syāditi [1] tasmād-
apratijño[2]pālambho [3] 'yaṃ bhavataḥ saṃpadyate / na hi vayaṃ
nāma sadbhūtamiti brūmaḥ /

[4]yatpunarbhavatoktam
atha vidyate svabhāvaḥ sa ca dharmāṇāṃ na vidyate tasmāt /
dharmairvinā svabhāvaḥ sa yasya tadyuktamupadeṣṭumiti //
atra brūmaḥ [5] /

atha   vidyate   svabhāvaḥ   sa   ca   dharmā-
ṇāṃ   na   vidyata   itīdam /
āśaṅkitaṃ   yaduktaṃ   bhavatyanāśaṅkitaṃ
tacca // 60 //

na hi vayaṃ dharmāṇāṃ svabhāvaṃ pratiṣedhayāmo dharma-
vinirmuktasya vā kasyacidarthasya svabhāvamabhyupagacchāmaḥ /
nanvevaṃ sati ya [6] upālambho bhavato yadi dharmā niḥsvabhāvāḥ
kasya khalvidānīmanyasyārthasya dharmavinirmuktasya svabhāvo
bhavati sa yuktamupadeṣṭumiti [7] dūrāpakṛṣṭamevaitadbhavati, upā-
lambho na bhavati [8] /

[9]yatpunarbhavatoktaṃ
sata eva pratiṣedho nāsti ghaṭo geha ityayaṃ yasmāt /
dṛṣṭaḥ pratiṣedho 'yaṃ sataḥ svabhāvasya te tasmāditi //
atra brūmaḥ /

sata   eva   pratiṣedho   yadi   śūnyatvaṃ
nanu   prasiddham[10]idam /

---

[1] C seems to have misunderstood and translates as if reading *asvabhāvaṃ nāma syāt*.

[2] *tasmād prati*°, R.

[3] T adds *api*.

[4] T inserts *anyac ca*.

[5] R om. *iti / atra brūmaḥ*.

[6] T om. *ya*.

[7] °*diṣṭam iti*, R.

[8] R om. *upālambho na bhavati*.

[9] T inserts *anyac ca*.

[10] *nanv apratisiddham*, R, against the metre.

pratiṣedhayate   hi   bhavān   bhāvānāṃ
niḥsvabhāvatvam // 61 //

yadi sata eva pratiṣedho bhavati nāsato bhavāṃśca sarvabhāvā-
nāṃ [1] niḥsvabhāvatvaṃ pratiṣedhayati, nanu prasiddhaṃ [2] sarva-
bhāvānāṃ niḥsvabhāvatvam / tvadvacanena pratiṣedhasadbhāvān [3]
niḥsvabhāvatvasya ca sarvabhāvānāṃ pratiṣiddhatvāt prasiddhā
śūnyatā [4] /

pratiṣedhayase   'tha [5]   tvaṃ   śūnyatvaṃ
tacca   nāsti   śūnyatvam /
pratiṣedhaḥ   sata   iti   te   nanveṣa [6]   vi-
hīyate   vādaḥ // 62 //

atha [7] pratiṣedhayasi tvaṃ sarvabhāvānāṃ niḥsvabhāvatvaṃ
śūnyatvaṃ nāstı tacca śūnyatvam, yā tarhi te pratijñā sataḥ
pratiṣedho bhavati nāsata iti sā hīnā /
kiṃ cānyat /

pratiṣedhayāmi   nāhaṃ   kiṃcit   pratiṣe-
dhyamasti   na   ca   kiṃcit /
tasmātpratiṣedhayasītyadhilaya   eṣa [8]   tvayā
kriyate // 63 //

[9] yadyahaṃ kiṃcitpratiṣedhayāmi tatastadapi tvayā [10] yuktameva
vaktuṃ syāt / na caivāhaṃ kiṃcitpratiṣedhayāmi, yasmānna [11]

---

[1] R om. *bhavāṃś ca sarva.*

[2] *pratisiddham,* R.

[3] R adds *yasi tvam* after *pratiṣedha.*

[4] *pratiṣiddhā śūnyeti,* R.

[5] ⁰*ṣedhayase atha,* R; alternatively read *ṣedhayasy atha.*

[6] R om. *ṣa.*

[7] R adds *śūnyatvam.*

[8] *eva,* R. *Adhilaya* (preferably read *skur pa* for *bkur pa* in T), " calumny ",
seems to be known only from Mādhyamika works; cf. *MMK,* Index s.v.

[9] R inserts *evam api tu kṛtvā.*

[10] R om. *tad api tvayā ; pratiṣedhayeyam* would be better grammar than *pratiṣe-*
dhayāmi.

[11] *tasmān na,* R.   The text follows T in dividing the sentences, but it would be
possible to take *yasmān* with the following *tasmāc.*

kiṃcitpratiṣeddhavyamasti [1] / tasmācchūnyeṣu sarvabhāveṣvavi-
dyamāne pratiṣedhye pratiṣedhe ca [2] pratiṣedhayasītyeṣa tvayā-
prastuto [3] 'dhilayaḥ kriyata iti [4] /

[5]yatpunarbhavatoktam
atha nāsti sa svabhāvaḥ kiṃ nu pratiṣidhyate tvayānena /
vacanenarte vacanātpratiṣedhaḥ sidhyate hyasata iti [6] //
atra brūmaḥ /

y a c c ā h a r t e [7]   v a c a n ā d a s a t a ḥ   p r a t i ṣ e d h a -
v a c a n a s i d d h i r i t i /
a t r a   j ñ ā p a y a t e   v ā g a s a d i t i   t a n n a   p r a t i -
n i h a n t i // 64 //

yacca bhavān bravīti, ṛte 'pi [8] vacanādasataḥ pratiṣedhaḥ
prasiddhaḥ, tatra kiṃ niḥsvabhāvāḥ sarvabhāvā ityetattvadvacana-
naṃ [9] karotīti, atra brūmaḥ / niḥsvabhāvāḥ sarvabhāvā [10] ityetat-
khalu vacanaṃ na niḥsvabhāvāneva [11] sarvabhāvān karoti / kiṃtv-
asati svabhāve bhāvā niḥsvabhāvā iti [12] jñāpayati / tadyathā [13]
kaścidbrūyādavidyamānagṛhe devadatte 'sti [14] gṛhe devadatta iti /
tatrainaṃ kaścitpratibrūyān nāstīti / na tadvacanaṃ devadatta-

---

[1] T adds *ca* or *api* after *kiṃcit*.

[2] R om. *pratiṣedhe ca*, but C has it too.

[3] e.c.; *tvayātra sadbhūto*, R.   T does not show *atra*, and its *thog tu mi babs pa*
means something like " missing the mark ", " not meeting the case ", and C
translates " contrary to reason and perverse ".   In view of R's extraordinary
distortions the conjectural restoration is palaeographically possible.

[4] T om. *iti*.

[5] T adds *anyac ca*.

[6] R. om. *iti*.

[7] *yac cāham te*, R; *yac cāha* is represented by *źe na* in T.

[8] *sato pi*, R.   T adds *asati ca vacane* before *ṛte*.

[9] R om. *tvad*.

[10] R om. *ḥ sarvabhāvā*.

[11] R om. *eva*.

[12] *kintv asatsvabhāvo bhāvānām asatsvabhāvānām iti*, R.

[13] *tatra*, R.

[14] *Devadattas tam asti*, R. *avidyamānagṛha* is a curious compound but occurs
in other texts.

syāsadbhāvaṃ ¹ karoti kiṃtu jñāpayati kevalamasaṃbhavaṃ ²
gṛhe devadattasya ³ / tadvannāsti svabhāvo bhāvānāmityetad-
vacanaṃ na bhāvānāṃ ⁴ niḥsvabhāvatvaṃ karoti kiṃtu sarva-
bhāveṣu ⁵ svabhāvasyābhāvaṃ jñāpayati / tatra yadbhavatoktaṃ
kimasati svabhāve nāsti svabhāva ityetadvacanaṃ karoti, ṛte 'pi
vacanāt prasiddhaḥ ⁶ svabhāvasyābhāva iti tanna ⁷ yuktam /
    anyacca ⁸ /
    bālānāmiva mithyā ⁹ mṛgatṛṣṇāyāṃ ¹⁰ yathājalagrāhaḥ /
    evaṃ mithyāgrāhaḥ syātte pratiṣedhyato ¹¹ hyasataḥ //
    ityādayo yā punaścatasro gāthā bhavatoktā ¹² atra brūmaḥ

    mṛgatṛṣṇādṛṣṭānte   yaḥ   punaruktas¹³-
    tvayā   mahāṃścarcaḥ /
    tatrāpi nirṇayaṃ śṛṇu yathā sa dṛṣṭānta
    upapannaḥ // 65 //

ya eta tvayā ¹⁴ mṛgatṛṣṇādṛṣṭānte mahāṃścarca uktastatrāpi
yo nirṇayaḥ sa śrūyatāṃ yathopapanna eṣa ¹⁵ dṛṣṭānto bhavati /

    sa   yadi   svabhāvataḥ   syād   grāho¹⁶   na
    syātpratītya   saṃbhūtaḥ¹⁷ /

----

¹ *na ta Devadattasya saṃbhavaṃ*, R; T shows that R has interchanged *saṃbhava*
and *asadbhāva* in this sentence.

² *asadbhāvam*, R.

³ R adds *iti*.

⁴ *svabhāvānāṃ*, R.

⁵ R om. *kiṃtu sarva*.   T interpolates a parallel with a *māyāpuruṣa*, which is not
found in C or R.

⁶ *prasiddhiḥ*, R.

⁷ *tat te na*, R.

⁸ *yad uktam*, R.

⁹ R om. *mithyā*.

¹⁰ R adds *sa*.

¹¹ *prasidhyate*, R.

¹² *yat punar bhavato mṛgatṛṣṇāyām ity*, R.

¹³ *uktam*, R.

¹⁴ T adds *tasmin*.

¹⁵ R omits *yathā* and reads *eva* for *eṣa*.

¹⁶ *bhāvo*, R.

¹⁷ *samudbhūtaḥ*, R, against the metre.

yaśca   pratītya   bhavati   grāho   nanu
śūnyatā   saiva // 66 //

yadi [1] mṛgatṛṣṇāyāṃ sa yathājalagrāhaḥ svabhāvataḥ syānna
syātpratītyasamutpannaḥ / yato mṛgatṛṣṇāṃ ca pratītya viparītaṃ
ca darśanam pratītyāyoniśomanaskāraṃ [2] ca pratītya syādudbhūto
'taḥ pratītyasamutpannaḥ / yataśca pratītyasamutpanno 'taḥ
svabhāvataḥ śūnya eva / yathā pūrvamuktaṃ tathā /
   kiṃ cānyat /

yadi ca svabhāvataḥ syād grāhaḥ kastaṃ
nivartayed [3] grāham /
śeṣeṣvapyeṣa   vidhistasmādeṣo [4]   'nupā-
lambhaḥ // 67 //

yadi ca mṛgatṛṣṇāyāṃ jalagrāhaḥ svabhāvataḥ syāt ka eva taṃ
vinivartayet / na hi svabhāvaḥ·śakyo vinivartayituṃ [5] yathā [6] gner-
uṣṇatvamapāṃ dravatvamākāśasya nirāvaraṇatvam / dṛṣṭaṃ cāsya
vinivartanam / tasmācchūnyasvabhāvo grāhaḥ [7] / yathā [8] caitad-
evaṃ śeṣeṣvapi dharmeṣveṣa kramaḥ pratyavagantavyo grāhya-
prabhṛtiṣu [9] pañcasu / tatra yadbhavatoktaṃ ṣaṭkabhāvādaśūnyāḥ [10]
sarvabhāvā iti tanna /
   yatpunarbhavatoktaṃ [11]
   hetośca te na siddhirnaiḥsvābhāvyātkuto hi te hetuḥ /
   nirhetukasya siddhirna copapannāsya te 'rthasyeti //
   atra brūmaḥ /

[1] R adds *ca.*
[2] T om. *pratītya.*
[3] *vinivartayed,* R, against the metre.
[4] *tasmād oṣo,* R.
[5] *nivartayitum,* R.
[6] *tathā°,* R.
[7] *grāhyaḥ,* R.
[8] *yadā,* R.
[9] *°pravṛttiṣu,* R.
[10] R omits *toktaṃ ṣaṭkabhā,* and T omits *bhavatā.*
[11] T has *anyac ca* instead.

etena hetvabhāvaḥ pratyuktaḥ pūrvam-
eva sa samatvāt/
mṛgatṛṣṇādṛṣṭāntavyāvṛttividhau ya uk-
taḥ prāk // 68 //

etena cedānīṃ carcena pūrvoktena hetvabhāvo 'pi pratyukto [1]
'vagantavyaḥ / ya eva hi carcaḥ pūrvasmin hetāvuktaḥ ṣaṭkapratiṣe-
dhasya sa evehāpi [2] carcayitavyaḥ /
yatpunarbhavatoktaṃ
pūrvaṃ cetpratiṣedhaḥ paścātpratiṣedhyamityanupapannam /
paścāccānupapanno yugapacca yataḥ svabhāvaḥ sanniti [3] //
atra brūmaḥ /

yastraikālye hetuḥ pratyuktaḥ pūrvam-
eva sa samatvāt/
traikālyapratihetuśca śūnyatāvādināṃ
prāptaḥ // 69 //

ya eva [4] hetustraikālye pratiṣedhavācī sa uktotaraḥ pratyava-
gantavyaḥ [5] / kasmāt / sādhyasamatvāt / tathā hi tvadvacanena
pratiṣedhastraikālye 'nupapannapratiṣedhavatsa pratiṣedhyo 'pi [6] /
tasmāt pratiṣedhapratiṣedhye 'sati yadbhavān [7] manyate pratiṣe-
dhaḥ pratiṣiddha [8] iti tanna / yastrikālapratiṣedhavācī [9] hetureṣa
eva śūnyatāvādināṃ prāptaḥ sarvabhāvasvabhāvapratiṣedhaka-
tvān [10] na bhavataḥ /

---

[1] R om. *ukto.*

[2] R om. *dhasya sa eve.*

[3] *svabhāvo 'san,* R and T (cf. note on verse 20). R om. *iti.*

[4] e.c.; *eṣa,* R; T omits the word.

[5] *pratyavamantaḥ,* R; T omits the word, but C has it.

[6] R mutilates this sentence, reading *yathā hi pratiṣedhas traikālye nopapa
pratiṣedhapratiṣedhe 'pi.* C supports T, having " Just as the *pratiṣedha* of the
traikālya is *anupapanna,* (your) words too are included among the *pratiṣedhapra-
tiṣedhya* things ".

[7] R om. *yad.*

[8] *pratisi,* R; C seems to have had *prāptaḥ.*

[9] *yataś caiṣa trikāla°,* R; *yaś ca trikāla°* might be better.

[10] T om. *svabhāva.*

athavā kathametaduktottaram /

pratiṣedhayāmi nāhaṃ kiṃcitpratiṣedhyamasti na ca kiṃcit /

tasmāt pratiṣedhayasītyadhilaya eṣa tvayā kriyate //

iti pratyuktam [1] / atha manyase triṣvapi kāleṣu pratiṣedhaḥ siddhaḥ [2], dṛṣṭaḥ pūrvakālīno 'pi hetuḥ, uttarakālīno 'pi, yugapatkālīno 'pi hetuḥ, tatra [3] pūrvakālīno heturyathā [4] pitā putrasya [5], paścātkālīno yathā śiṣya ācāryasya, yugapatkālīno yathā pradīpaḥ prakāśasyetyatra brūmaḥ / na caitadevam / uktā [6] hyetasmin krame trayaḥ [7] pūrvadoṣāḥ / api ca yadyevam [8], pratiṣedhasadbhāvastvayābhyupagamyate [9] pratijñāhāniśca te bhavati / etena krameṇa svabhāvapratiṣedho 'pi siddhaḥ [10] /

prabhavati ca śūnyateyaṃ yasya pra-
bhavanti tasya sarvārthāḥ /
prabhavati na tasya kiṃcinna prabha-
vati [11] śūnyatā yasya [12] // 70 //

yasya śūnyateyaṃ prabhavati tasya sarvārthā laukikalokottarāḥ prabhavanti / kiṃ kāraṇam / yasya hi śūnyatā prabhavati tasya pratītyasamutpādaḥ prabhavati / yasya pratītyasamutpādaḥ prabhavati tasya catvāryāryasatyāni prabhavanti / yasya catvāryāryasatyāni prabhavanti tasya [13] śrāmaṇyaphalāni prabhavanti [14], sarva-

---

[1] R om. *pratyuktam.*

[2] R omits *pratiṣedhaḥ siddhaḥ*, which C has too.

[3] *katham*, R.

[4] R om. *hetur.*

[5] R inserts *tvadvacanena.*

[6] *na caitad eva yuktā*, R.

[7] R omits *krame*, and T omits *trayaḥ* which C has.

[8] R adds *kramaḥ.*

[9] °*bhāvatve yā*°, R. T adds *tasminn asiddhe.*

[10] R omits *etena krameṇa* and '*pi siddhaḥ*; C has the latter.

[11] *kinna bhavati*, R (two syllables short). For the verse cf. *MMK*, XXIV, 14; Candrakīrti's commentary there follows closely Nāgārjuna's commentary here.

[12] R adds *iti.*

[13] R omits *prabhavanti tasya*, which is found in C and in T.

[14] R om. *pra.*

viśeṣādhigamāḥ prabhavanti [1] / yasya sarvaviśeṣādhigamāḥ pra-
bhavanti tasya trīṇi ratnāni buddhadharmasaṃghāḥ prabhavanti /
yasya pratītyasamutpādaḥ prabhavati tasya dharmo dharmahetur-
dharmaphalaṃ ca prabhavanti [2], tasyādharmo 'dharmaheturadhar-
maphalaṃ ca prabhavanti / yasya dharmādharmau dharmādhar-
mahetū dharmādharmaphale ca prabhavanti [3] / tasya kleśaḥ
kleśasamudayaḥ kleśavastūni [4] ca prabhavanti / yasyaitatsarvaṃ
prabhavati [5] pūrvoktaṃ tasya sugatidurgativyavasthā sugatidur-
gatigamanaṃ sugatidurgatigāmī mārgaḥ [6] sugatidurgativyatikra-
maṇaṃ [7] sugatidurgativyatikramopāyaḥ sarvasaṃvyavahārāśca
laukikā vyavasthāpitāḥ [8] / svayamadhigantavyā anayā diśā kiṃ-
cicchakyaṃ vacanenopadeṣṭumiti [9] /

bhavati cātra

yaḥ śūnyatāṃ pratītyasamutpādaṃ madhyamāṃ pratipadaṃ ca[10] /
ekārthāṃ nijagāda praṇamāmi tamapratimabuddham [11] //
iti [12] kṛtiriyamācāryanāgārjunapādānām //

---

[1] R om. *pra.* T abridges these three sentences, reading *yasya hi śūnyatā pra-
bhavati tasya pratītyasamutpādaś catvāry āryasatyāni śrāmaṇyaphalāni sarvaviśe-
ṣādhigamāḥ prabhavanti;* but C corroborates R, except that it omits the reference
to the *śrāmaṇyaphalāni.*

[2] *prabhavati,* R, and again in the next clause. C inserts *yasya dharmo dharma-
hetuś ca dharmaphalaṃ ca prabhavanti.*

[3] R omits this clause, which both C and T have, but the exact wording is un-
certain.

[4] °*vastuno,* R.

[5] R om. *pra.*

[6] *sattvaḥ,* T; C perhaps read *dharmaḥ.* The reading is therefore uncertain.

[7] R adds *gamana* after *durgati.*

[8] R om. *vyavasthāpitāḥ.*

[9] R omits *na,* and T omits *iti.*

[10] *pratipadam anekārthām,* R, against the metre and leaving the next line defective.

[11] *apratimasaṃbuddham,* R, against the metre.

[12] T om. *iti.*

INDEX OF KĀRIKĀS